

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, March 14, 1994
Volume 30—Number 10
Pages 441–503

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

American Society of Association Executives—454
Earned-income tax credit announcement—478
Habitat for Humanity—443
New York City
 AmeriCorps Public Safety Forum—487
 United Negro College Fund Dinner—496
Radio address—441
“Reemployment Act of 1994”—481
Special Counsel to the President, announcement—462
Summit of the Americas—499

Appointments and Nominations

See also Addresses and Remarks
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Board of Directors—478
U.S. District Court, judges—486
White House Office, Deputy Assistant to the President for Speechwriting and Research—486

Communications to Congress

Corporation for Public Broadcasting, message transmitting report—461
Maritime boundary treaties with the United Kingdom, message transmitting—486
Nuclear cooperation with EURATOM, message—485
Trade agreements program, message transmitting report—461

Communications to Federal Agencies

Earned-income tax credit, memorandum—481

Executive Orders

Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation at Federal Facilities—470
Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM—484

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
 Briefing Room—462
 Oval Office—445, 478
News conference with Chairman Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia, March 7 (No. 52)—445

Joint Statements

Declaration on Relations Between the United States and the Republic of Georgia—452

Letters and Messages

See also Resignations and Retirements
Id al-Fitr, message—484

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

Republic of Georgia, Chairman Shevardnadze—445

Proclamations

Irish-American Heritage Month—461

Resignations and Retirements

Counsel to the President, letter—442

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
Energy efficiency and water conservation at Federal facilities—477
“Maritime Security and Trade Act of 1994”—499

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—503
Checklist of White House press releases—502
Digest of other White House announcements—501
Nominations submitted to the Senate—501

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, March 11, 1994

The President's Radio Address

March 5, 1994

Good morning. Today I want to talk to you about what we're doing to put America back to work and to have more good-paying jobs.

When you sent me to Washington, you entrusted me with the responsibility of turning our Nation's economy around and improving the lives of hardworking, middle class Americans, the people who were hit hardest during the recession and the jobless recovery that followed. So this administration took action, took responsibility. And in the last 13 months, we've worked to change the economic course of our country from recession-weary to healthy and growing. And that began to change the mood of our people, making us more confident again in ourselves and our possibilities.

We had to break gridlock in Congress to get discipline into the budget and to begin bringing down our Nation's deficit. We created a healthier climate for business, leading to more investment and more jobs coming into the economy. We began to level the playing field in global trade, opening up opportunities to sell American products and services around the world. And at the same time, we began to expand access to education and training at home so that more of our people can compete and win in the world economy.

When I took office as your President, I said our goal was to create 8 million jobs in 4 years. Critics said it couldn't be done. But it can if we have the right economic strategy and if we stick with it.

The Department of Labor has just confirmed that in the first 13 months of our administration, the economy has created an additional 2,090,000 jobs, more than 90 percent of them in the private sector, so we're well on our way. In just 13 months, the economy has generated nearly twice as many private

sector jobs than the total for the entire previous 4 years.

Of course it's heartening that more people are collecting paychecks and many Americans are personally feeling the economic turn for the better, maybe with a first home or a new car financed at lower interest rates. But still there are too many Americans hurting, without jobs, or people settling for part-time work, many too discouraged to even look for work, and millions and millions of Americans working harder every year for the same or lower wages. I say to those Americans, don't give up. I promise all of you, when it comes to lifting our economy and creating opportunity, we won't let up, not for an instant. When it comes to jobs, we want to create 2 million more in '94. We'll keep building on the firm foundations already set in place.

Last year Congress passed the first phase of our economic plan. It's already had a major impact on the deficit. The 1995 deficit projection has gone down \$120 billion, that's 40 percent lower than it was estimated to be when I took office. The next installment of the plan is now before the Congress. It cuts spending in more than 350 nondefense programs, eliminates 100 of them outright. We are keeping faith with our goal to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion in 5 years. This is the first serious effort by any recent administration to attack this deficit. And it set the stage for much of the economic progress that's been made.

Because of this progress, because of the lower interest rates, we're in a better position to compete in the world. It's a fact, once again, from agricultural products to technology and services, America is making the products the world wants to buy. Our challenge is gaining access to the markets of our competitors, and we're taking that challenge head-on, too. We've torn down trade barriers with NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, with the worldwide General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to nego-

tiate open markets everywhere and at our conference with the Asian and Pacific nations where so much of the world's growth is occurring.

In one year, we've done more to open markets than any other recent administration, but where unfair barriers to our exports remain, we still have work to do. So this week, I signed an Executive order reviving a process to open markets called Super 301. It will help us to set priorities for opening markets around the world by identifying those practices, wherever they occur, that erect unfair barriers to American products and to the products of other countries as well. It will help us tailor our responses to these barriers to trade. And this is the payoff: 20,000 jobs for every \$1 billion we sell in American exports, jobs that pay, on average, 22 percent more than other American wages. And because these jobs require the most up-to-date skills, we're moving to make our workers the best trained in the world. Next week, with the support of business and labor, we will introduce the "Reemployment Act of 1994" to bring our training programs into the 21st century, replacing the existing unemployment system with a reemployment system, recognizing that most Americans don't get called back to the same jobs they lose, and the average American will change work seven times in a lifetime.

Then later this month, I'll be in Detroit to meet with the ministers of the G-7 nations. The subject will be jobs: How can the wealthy countries create more jobs and make sure our people are trained properly for them?

Let me be clear: Of all the many important responsibilities of this office, putting America to work takes priority. Welfare reform is an important part of this picture, too. And reforming health care goes hand in hand, assuring our people that they need not fear they'll lose their medical coverage when they move from welfare to work or from their old jobs to new ones.

Make no mistake, more than 2 million jobs were created last year because we took responsibility and began to get our economic house in order. Now we have to keep our commitments to reduce the deficit, grow the

economy, and create jobs. We can do that by passing this tough new budget, adopting our programs for skills, new jobs, and new opportunities. Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:06 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Letter Accepting the Resignation of Bernard W. Nussbaum as Counsel to the President

March 5, 1994

Dear Bernie:

With deep regret, I accept your decision to resign as Counsel to the President. Your friendship and advice have meant a great deal to me over the years.

During your tenure, this Administration named the highest percentage of women and minorities to the Federal Judiciary in history, while meeting, in a vast number of cases, the highest standards set by the American Bar Association. These Judges and Justices will leave a lasting imprint on our case law, and their places on the federal bench will be clear and abiding signs of encouragement to those long excluded from administering our system of justice. Those serving, and those who can now dream of being considered, owe you a great debt of gratitude.

You played an especially significant role in the selections of Attorney General Janet Reno, FBI Director Louis Freeh, and Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg—people who will make our streets safer and our society more just for years to come. They are pioneers, and yours was the lamp that lit their way.

It has been said that the best a man can give is his living spirit to a service that is not easy. And we have worked together in Washington at a time when serving is hard. But you gave this Administration one of its liveliest spirits and keenest minds, along with your special reverence for duty and friendship. For these contributions, I will be for-

ever grateful; for your accomplishments, I hope you will be forever proud.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Dear Mr. President:

It has been a great honor and privilege to serve you as Counsel to the President. I am proud of the accomplishments of this Administration and those that I know will be achieved in the months and years to come. I am also proud of the many contributions my office has made to the wide array of policy initiatives of your Administration.

It was also an honor to have assisted in your choice of Janet Reno to be Attorney General of the United States, Louis J. Freeh to be the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Ruth Bader Ginsburg to sit on the Supreme Court of the United States. I am particularly proud of assisting in your selection of more than 60 men and women of the most distinguished and diverse backgrounds ever to serve on the federal bench.

As I know you know, from the day I became Counsel, my sole objective was to serve you as well and as effectively as I could, consistent with the rules of law, standards of ethics, and the highest traditions of the Bar. At all times I have conducted the Office of the White House Counsel and performed the duties of Counsel to the President in an absolutely legal and ethical manner. Unfortunately, as a result of controversy generated by those who do not understand, nor wish to understand the role and obligations of a lawyer, even one acting as White House Counsel, I now believe I can best serve you by returning to private life. With this letter I am therefore tendering my resignation. It will be effective April 5, 1994, to assist you in arranging for an orderly transition in the Counsel's office.

I will always value your friendship and that of the First Lady, and will always be grateful for the opportunity you gave me to serve. I wish you both the very best.

Very respectfully,

Bernard W. Nussbaum

NOTE: Originals were not available for verification of the content of these letters.

Remarks at a Habitat for Humanity Dedication Ceremony

March 7, 1994

Thank you so much, Frank. And thank you all for being here, Mayor Kelly, Carol Casperson, Mr. Walker, Reverend Weathers, and others, and especially to Vivian and Theron Miller. I have really looked forward to coming here today because, as Frank said so eloquently, this house, the work, the love, the concern that made it, reflects what I think we have to do as a people to rebuild the American community and to give this country back to our children and to the future.

I have cared a lot about and tried to support Habitat for Humanity for a long time. Millard and Linda Fuller are good friends of Hillary's and mine, and I received a letter from Millard this morning explaining that he couldn't be here today because he's speaking at the Kansas State prayer breakfast. He might have said he couldn't be here today because he's heard me give this speech so many times before—[laughter]—but we really owe all of this to their vision and their lifetime of commitment to service.

In the summer of 1992, on my birthday, which is also Tipper Gore's birthday, the Gores and Hillary and I worked on a Habitat project with President and Mrs. Carter in Georgia. It was one of the most memorable birthdays of my life.

I like Habitat because it makes the American dream of homeownership possible for good people who are working hard and doing their best and who themselves have to work to make this work. I like it because it involves giving and because it doesn't involve the Government, although in a place or two, for example, down in Florida after the terrible hurricane, we're trying to do a few things which will make it possible for Habitat to do more.

We're also trying to help, as Mayor Kelly said, under the able leadership of Henry Cisneros—the former mayor of San Antonio—the Department of Housing and Urban Development is working directly with Habitat affiliates all over the country to get HUD-foreclosed properties into the hands of low-income buyers. When you think about how

many boarded-up houses there are in America and how many people there are living on the streets, when you think about how many boarded-up buildings there are in America and how many Vivian Millers there are out there who would give anything to have a chance to work with her friends and her neighbors and her church to get a home, it is unconscionable that we do not do more. Secretary Cisneros is committed to carrying out this administration's mission to do more, to make it easier for local governments to make more use of the HOME program, which provides block grants for affordable housing, and to put the Federal Housing Administration back into the business of helping folks buy their first loans.

Last year, FHA had its second best year in its 60-year history, insuring more than a million mortgages including 400,000 mortgages for first-time home buyers, most of them young folks in their twenties and thirties, an age group that still has a harder time buying a home today than it did in the previous generation. But we know that Government cannot do this job alone. And I have to tell you, I was very moved by what Frank Belatti said today. I have eaten a lot of his chicken over time—[laughter]—I think I eat more now. And I'm glad they didn't buy that ad at the Super Bowl, aren't you? And instead they purchased this home.

You know, during my Inauguration—Frank ought to give himself a little more credit, he had already decided to build 100 homes through Habitat for Humanity. But because of the spirit of the moment, which he has so eloquently recounted, he decided that he would double it and do 200 homes and make millions of dollars in contributions to dreams for people like Vivian and Theron Miller. And it's not only the largest financial contribution in Habitat's history, it mobilized, because of that money, the volunteer efforts of young and not-so-young Habitat volunteers all across America, people who want to give something to their country, who can't afford to pay for the materials to rehab it but are more than happy to come and roll up their sleeves and work on weekends with people like Vivian Miller to make homeownership a possibility.

So today, thanks to Habitat and to this wonderful corporation and its leader and the people here in DC, Vivian Miller joins the proud ranks of America's homeowners. Before you know it, she'll be complaining of all the junk mail in her mailbox, just like everybody else. [Laughter] Vivian, I congratulate you and your two sons, including the one who is in college and can't be here today. Congratulations to this community and all those who made it possible. I want to once again thank your pastor and your church for supporting you and all the others who volunteered to work on this project.

I believe that Habitat has the capacity to literally revolutionize the sense of community and responsibility, caring about one another in this country. And I hope that Frank Belatti's example will be followed by business leaders throughout the country. I hope more and more people will be doing this. And I assure you that we are committed to moving these properties that can be restored and can be made living places with happy homes and happy families and stronger communities. If we can do our part, we're going to do it.

But all of you have made this possible today. This is a great day for the American spirit, and I hope all over America tonight, when people see this, they will draw renewed strength and pride and ask themselves: What can I do to make more of these things happen?

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:32 a.m. in Southeast Washington, DC. In his remarks, he referred to Frank Belatti, chief executive officer, America's Favorite Chicken Co. and owner of Church's and Popeye's; Sharon Pratt Kelly, Mayor of Washington, DC; Carol Casperson, executive director, Washington, DC, Habitat for Humanity; Wayne Walker, member of the International Board of Directors, Habitat for Humanity; Rev. Eugene Weathers of Galilee Baptist Church; Vivian Miller, a single mother who was given a house through Habitat for Humanity, and her son, Theron Slater; and Millard and Linda Fuller, president/founder and co-founder of Habitat for Humanity International, respectively.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us whether you or the First Lady were ever briefed after those meetings that have now been brought under question by the special counsel?

The President. I'm going to have a question-and-answer session after Chairman Shevardnadze and I have our meeting, and I'll be glad to answer some questions then.

Q. Would you answer that question later for us?

The President. I'll be glad to answer questions, yes.

Republic of Georgia

Q. What can you tell us about your meeting today with Mr. Shevardnadze? Are you able to offer more help? Are you concerned about recent developments in Russia and what threat they may provide to his country?

The President. Well, the United States has strongly supported Chairman Shevardnadze and the territorial integrity of Georgia. We've done our best to be good allies, and last year we tried to help with aid and we will do so again this year.

We want to talk a little about what can be done to help with peacekeeping efforts there and about other matters that affect their destiny in Georgia, including, obviously, events in Russia and other countries in the region. So I've really looked forward to this meeting for a long time. And I have many questions; I'm going to be listening hard today.

Q. [Inaudible]—U.N. troops there? U.N. troops to Georgia?

The President. Well, we want to talk about that today. We're going to have a visit about that.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:05 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

The President's News Conference With Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze of the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

The President. It's a real pleasure and an honor for me to welcome Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze to the White House today. Few leaders in our time have earned the degree of international respect that Chairman Shevardnadze enjoys. He's a statesman whose vision and diplomacy have played an immeasurably important role in bringing a peaceful end to the cold war.

This was our first personal meeting, although we've talked by phone on other occasions. It was a productive one. We discussed the great political and economic challenges facing Georgia. We discussed the steps the United States can take to help Georgia to meet those challenges.

I reaffirmed in very strong terms America's support for the independence, the sovereignty, and the territorial integrity of Georgia. And I expressed support for the efforts sponsored by the United Nations to find a lasting political settlement to the conflict in the Abkhaz region of Georgia. I'm hopeful that the parties to that conflict can achieve in their negotiations and maintain an effective cease-fire. If they can, the United States would be inclined to support a U.N. peacekeeping operation in Georgia, an operation that would not involve U.S. military units. We've already begun consultations on this issue with the Congress, whose views and support will be important. And Chairman Shevardnadze will have the opportunity to discuss this and other matters with Members of Congress during his stay here with us.

In our meeting today, we also discussed Georgia's efforts to expand cooperation with other nations in the Caucasus region. We agreed that both our nations have a tremendous stake in the success of reform in Russia, that a democratic and market-oriented Russia at peace with its neighbors is in the interests of Georgia and the United States.

I made it clear in our talks that the U.S. is committed to encouraging greater political freedom and economic renewal in Georgia. That commitment is outlined by the joint

declaration and bilateral investment treaty we've signed today.

Our commitment is also underscored by the \$70 million in assistance the U.S. has allocated to Georgia so far this year. Most of these funds are dedicated to humanitarian efforts. As Georgia moves toward peace and proceeds with reform, we're prepared to increase our technical and economic assistance as well.

This is clearly a difficult time of transition for Georgia. But throughout its rich history, Georgia many times has met and overcome adversity. I'm hopeful that the renowned resilience of the Georgian people will serve them well as they build a more stable and prosperous future. As they face that work, the Georgian people are indeed fortunate to have a leader with a vision, the stature, the leadership, and the courage of Chairman Shevardnadze. And I look forward to working with him in the days ahead.

Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Shevardnadze. Dear Mr. President—President Clinton, ladies and gentlemen. Each of my sessions and meetings with the press is connected to one or another event. For instance, I appeared here before you when the INF agreement was signed and when the Soviet troops were brought out of Afghanistan. There were very many interesting historical events, *perestroika* and democratization. We had a root change in the relations between our superpowers. This meeting with you, Mr. President, is also tied to a very significant event.

It's possible that I and my country in this first, my official visit to the United States, could be one of the largest. President Clinton has just signed, and I have just signed, a declaration on the principles of relations between the United States of America and Georgia. As leaders of our governments, we have affixed our signatures and say that Georgia will adhere to the NPT.

We have made a very large, at least for Georgia, a very large step. In a series of discussions, have been talking about a whole series of important events, important for Georgia. Georgia is a very small country, but it is large in its attitude toward big political issues related to all of the other countries that now exist and that came out of the

former Soviet Union when the Soviet Union passed. And I think what we now are seeing are very important events regarding the future of all of us countries in this region. As many of the other independent and sovereign countries of that region, Georgia, too, needs a lot of assistance.

The integration within the CIS calls upon us to overcome many, many problems and obstacles. But I am convinced that assistance from the West is also very important to help us go the way. No one country will be able to make it to democracy and to market economy without assistance from the outside.

One of the many conflicts on the territory of the former Soviet Union and in Georgia as well—these are horrible conflicts, but we can say that this conflict on our territory is yet only one of a whole arc, a great arc of conflicts that is taking place in our region. This is a big threat to international peace. And we should do like you said, Mr. President, today in all of our discussions, we should be very careful of our actions and our attitudes.

We have touched upon a whole series of issues related to our Partnership For Peace, the initiator of which is Mr. President Clinton. I say that Georgia actively supports you and hopes to be just as active in the implementation of the partnership of peace. That's the most important thing.

I informed President Clinton of our approach in the political settlement of the Abkhazian conflict. On the 9th of March, I'm going to appear at the Security Council session of the United Nations, and there I'm going to attempt to explain my views on this issue.

Within the visit also that's planned, where I plan to meet the heads of a variety of international financial institutions, we're going to set forth some of the greater priorities for Georgia, the investment of funds into Georgia to a stabilization fund, a democratization fund, if necessary, to help us move toward reforms.

We discussed also with President Clinton the events in Russia. As usual, I am always coming out in favor of supporting President Yeltsin and the policy that he has set forth. And I have spoken with President Clinton about some of the trends that we are seeing

taking place in Russia. We are very much interested in seeing that Russian democracy flourishes, also, in other countries around Russia, and I think all of us will be working toward that success. Otherwise, the events in Russia should be viewed very closely, in very close relationship to what happens in other states and other countries.

I'm very appreciative to President Clinton for all of his support which he has shown and continues to show to Georgia, now experiencing a very, very tough time. Right now, Mr. President has just announced the necessary funds of humanitarian assistance to Georgia. I must say that if it were not for the assistance of the American people and your support, Mr. President, our people, our Georgian people, in the fullest sense of the word would be starving. Thank you. Thank you so very much.

And to the press that's here, I would like to, in your presence, to invite President Clinton to come to Georgia at any time that is convenient to you, Mr. President. Thank you so much.

The President. Let me say what I would like to do now. I'll recognize Terry [Terence Hunt, Associated Press], and then we will try to alternate to give the Georgian press a chance to ask questions. We'll recognize the American press, the Georgian press in the alternate.

Go ahead, Terry.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, there were at least three occasions where White House officials were briefed by Federal regulators about the status of the Whitewater investigation. Were you and Mrs. Clinton aware of those contacts, and what were you told about the content of those discussions?

The President. Well, there were no briefings, and I didn't know about, for example, Roger Altman's meeting until he testified to it on the Hill. And one of the other contacts, I think, was a press contact of some kind. I was unaware of that one.

Sometime in October, I was—I became aware of—I don't know when, but sometime in October, I became aware of the RTC finding with regard to the question—the referral, I think it's called, on the question of whether

my campaign benefited improperly from checks which allegedly came from the S&L, and I knew about that. That was—I don't remember when I knew about it or who told me about it, but it was just sort of presented as a fact, a decision that had been made by the Government. And I didn't think much about it at the time. It was just something that I absorbed. It was told to me just as something that the Government had decided to do. Otherwise, I was not aware of any of these things.

Now, let me remind you of what we have done in the last few days. First, to avoid any question arising in the future of the propriety of any of these actions, we have literally erected a firewall between the White House and other regulatory agencies so that any contact, in or out, relating to any of these matters would have to be cleared by and approved by the Counsel's office, so that all of these matters will be clear and proper.

Secondly, we have committed to fully support and cooperate with the Special Counsel's subpoenas to look into this. On Friday night, as soon as the subpoenas were received, the White House Deputy Counsel, Joel Klein, sent a memo to all the White House staff describing the documents called for and a procedure to fully comply. This morning, the Chief of Staff, Mr. McLarty, has sent a detailed compliance memo from Mr. Klein to all the staff setting forth the procedures that the staff must follow to make sure that compliance is full and complete.

Second, we have begun in earnest—I have, personally—a process to select a new White House Counsel. And I want to make it just exactly clear what I'm looking for. Number one, I want someone of unquestioned integrity and a lot of experience in dealing with the kinds of issues that have to come into the White House, someone who can establish processes that everyone will acknowledge are appropriate to deal with all the legal matters that the White House deals with. And finally, someone who will inspire confidence in me and in you, the press, and most importantly, in the American people that we are going the extra mile not only in this case but in all cases to deal with all matters in the appropriate way. So I think that we're doing every-

thing we can. We certainly intend to do that. And we'll be aggressive in pursuit of it.

Yes, anyone over here? Yes.

Republic of Georgia

Q. Mr. President, I want to ask you about your feeling. What do you feel when you hear such words, "Thank you very much for your helping because your helping helped us not suffer." What do you feel when you hear such words?

The President. I didn't have my ear-phones on, excuse me.

Q. Mr. President, she says what do you feel when people tell you that you have saved our people from hunger and starvation?

The President. She asked: What do I feel when people say that the United States has saved many people in Georgia from hunger and starvation?

I feel a sense of gratitude that we had the opportunity to do it. Most of the people in our country understand that we are very fortunate to live here, to have the system that we have, to have the economy that we have, and that we have responsibilities and opportunities around the world that we discharge as well as we can. The people of Georgia have carried on an historic and courageous struggle. Chairman Shevardnadze has become the embodiment of that struggle for us here in America and for people all over the world. And I'm glad that, last year on a couple of occasions, the United States was able to move rapidly and to be helpful. We long for the day when you will not need it anymore. And we know that you do, too.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International.]

Hillary Clinton

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel now that your wife is becoming the focal point of the Whitewater investigation, and the Washington Times quotes three couriers as testifying that she ordered the shredding of documents? I know this is all very painful, but I wonder how it affected you in your household and—

The President. Well, let me say that the only thing that I want to say on behalf of both of us is that we want to support the

Special Counsel's work and we want to ask the American people to let the process work.

Law firms dispose of their documents all the time. And I did not read the article, but I understand the article didn't purport to say what the contents of any of the files were. I can tell you this: I believe I'm a better authority than anybody else in America on my wife; I have never known a person with a stronger sense of right and wrong in my life. Ever. I could cite you chapter and verse over 20 years-plus now that I have known her when it would have been very easy for her to take a shortcut, to take an easy way out, to do something else, when she has unfailingly done the right thing. And I do not believe for a moment that she has done anything wrong. I have—I just—If the rest of the people in this country, if everybody in this country had a character as strong as hers, we wouldn't have half the problems we've got today. Now people can ask whatever questions they want, and we will do our best to comply. But I'm just telling you, the American people can worry about something else. Her moral compass is as strong as anybody's in this country, and they will see that.

Abkhazia

Q. Mr. President, the most painful problem for Georgia today is the Abkhazian issue. How do you see a specific role of the United States in the settlement of this issue, specifically? Thank you.

The President. Well, that's what Chairman Shevardnadze and I talked about, mostly, at our first meeting. The United States should support Georgia's efforts to secure a United Nations peacekeeping effort and to have the kinds of conditions that will permit the peacekeeping to succeed, for example, a clear strategy for returning the refugees to their home. The United States would not be called upon to provide troops but would want to see that the troop force was a good, balanced U.N. troop force mix, and I think we should be prepared to contribute some of the cost of operating the peacekeeping mission.

I have already opened conversations with the Congress about that. And as I said, the Chairman is going to talk to Members of Congress, and because of his long and distinguished relationship with the United States,

going back to his days as foreign minister of the former Soviet Union, he has a lot of friends in the Congress, and he might well be able to have a very positive impact. He might be able to get more money out of them than I can. [Laughter] But together we're going to do our best to get the support.

Chairman Shevardnadze. Maybe I'll convince them to give me some money for other purposes, too.

The President. Maybe you can lobby for my health care plan. [Laughter]

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, your Chief of Staff, Mack McLarty, said that he knew about one of the meetings with the Treasury officials. Can you tell us why he didn't seem to understand that that kind of meeting would give the appearance of impropriety? And does the fact that he didn't, diminish your confidence in him?

The President. No, because I didn't know until yesterday, I guess, that the ethics counsel for the Treasury Department had apparently approved the Altman meeting.

Let me tell you what I've told him to do. Let me just tell you what—I have instructed the staff not only to fully comply with this subpoena but to examine the records and the memories of everyone for any conceivable contact during this time period, so that any facts that need to be disclosed can be fully disclosed and completely evaluated. I think the evidence that we have certainly makes it clear that no one tried to influence any governmental procedure or do anything improper. But as I said before, last week, it would have been better if at least some of these meetings had not occurred. And we now have the firewall established which will guarantee that it won't happen in the future.

I do ask you for some sense of balance about what's going on here. I did not see it, but I understand Sam Dash was last night on television and pointed out that, unlike some previous administrations, we were fully cooperating. We were giving the records, we were giving whatever we were asked to give not only to Special Counsel. We weren't resisting, we were supporting subpoenas. This administration is determined to have a standard by which anybody else in the future will

be judged in how we deal with this sort of inquiry. I just want the inquiry to proceed. I want it to have a chance to succeed. I have no reason to believe at this time that anybody did anything to influence a Government process they should not have done. But if you look at it going from here forward, I think we have procedures in place, and I will pick a White House Counsel that will assure that there's a high level of confidence about how we're operating this.

Looking backward, we are fully complying with all of these subpoenas, and we're going to find any other facts that need to be found and need to be disclosed, and we will do that, too.

Russia

Q. [Inaudible]—cases of democratization of Russia where they're having difficulties and where democracy is not really moving along as fast. How is some of that affecting relations between United States and Russia and maybe other countries within the CIS?

The President. Well, as you know, the United States has worked with and supported President Yeltsin because we believe that he followed policies supporting democracy, supporting reform, and supporting respect for the territorial integrity of Russia's neighbors, all three things. That is still our policy; we are interested in supporting those things. And we believe that there are ways for Russia to continue to manifest its leadership in the world and in the region and still acknowledge the importance of democracy, market reform, and respect for neighbors.

I'm very hopeful, just to take one example, of what happened in Bosnia recently, where the Russians played a very key role in helping us to create the safe zone around Sarajevo, getting the Serbs to support it. Now that we have the outline of an agreement between the Croats and the Muslims, we hope the Russians will continue to be active with us to push right through to a solution to the crisis in Bosnia.

So, am I concerned about some developments in Russia and some of the things that some of the people say in Russia that reflect ultranationalism and an extremist view and would make more difficult our future relationships with them? Of course I am. But

I knew when this started that it would not be an easy course. Democracy is a difficult system to develop and to keep going. But I think basically our interests are clear, and we'll just continue to pursue our interests and our values and hope that our policy works.

Peter [Peter Maer, Westwood One Radio].

Republican Criticism

Q. Mr. President, I'm wondering what goes through your mind when you hear critics—I guess, especially Republican critics—compare this current controversy to Watergate, and what goes through your mind when you hear someone like Senator Gramm formulate a statement by starting with the statement that, “if the President wants to finish up his term”?

The President. Well, I wonder why you let him get away with it. I mean, frankly, when they say things, it doesn't really bother me. They have been, on the whole, blatantly partisan, and it's obvious that they want to do something that I don't think the American people ought to let them get away with, which is to deter this administration and the entire Federal Government from meeting its responsibilities to the people. I mean, it's a good excuse for why you don't have a health care plan. Go down and have a health care retreat; you can't agree on a plan; come back and jump on this issue. And the American people will be outraged if anybody uses this as an excuse not to keep going and doing the people's business, first of all.

Secondly, the Speaker of the House was very eloquent about this last weekend. There is a huge difference here. Number one, we're not covering up or anything, we are opening up. We are disclosing. We are giving you information. Number two, no one has accused me of any abuse of authority in office. That's what Watergate was about. Number three, there is no credible evidence and no credible charge that I violated any criminal or civil Federal law 8 or 9 years ago when most of these facts that are being bandied around are discussed. I mean, this is really about a real estate investment I made almost 16 years ago now that lost money and sputtered to a not successful conclusion several years ago. So there is no analogy except any hysteria that

they can gin up around it. That's why I say I have been forthcoming; I will continue to be forthcoming. You're going to be confident in the way we handle this. There will not be a coverup. There will not be an abuse of power in this office. And there is no credible charge that I violated any law, even way back in the dark ages or years ago when this happened.

And I would just remind you, I was Governor of my State for 12 years; there was never a hint of scandal in my administration. So this is going to be a very different thing. And I think that what they do today as Republicans, as a party, may look good today. It may not look very good when the independent counsel finishes his work. And I think, you know, they ought to think long and hard about whether this sort of partisan clamor and careless use of language and careless use of the facts is really not only in the best interest of the American people but in the best interest of their party. All of us got hired here to work for the American people, not to throw off on each other. I know a lot of people in this town like to do it, but it's a very unproductive use of time.

If I did something wrong, it will come out in the Special Counsel. That's what the Republicans said they wanted. That's what most of your media outlets said you wanted. I am fully cooperating with the Special Counsel. They will find the truth. Let them do it. And let the rest of us go on with our business. That's what we got the Special Counsel for.

Russia

Q. To you and Mr. Shevardnadze, how do you feel vis-a-vis the latest events in Moscow? Is there a possibility of a rebirth of the period of the cold war?

The President. I'll give him the hard question on the theory that he hasn't talked since I have.

Chairman Shevardnadze. I've had a lot of occasions to get out and speak about this. I don't want to create an impression that we are discussing Russia's future here. It's very important to be very tactful, maximally tactful here, and let the Russians themselves figure out what they want to do in the processes in their own country.

Now, as far as the alarm, well, naturally, every honest citizen of the planet has that fear, has that alarm relative to all the events that have taken place there recently. But I very much hope that the Russian people and everyone else there in Russia will figure this out. Is there a danger? Yes. If the forces that you have in mind come to power, this is a great threat not only for Russia but also for the whole planet at large. That's what I would say.

The President. Let me answer the question and make two points, one positive, the other not so positive.

You ask, is it possible that we will recreate the cold war. In one respect, it is unlikely for sure, and that is the nuclear respect. That is, you know, yesterday the first nuclear warheads went across the border from Ukraine into Russia, as Ukraine continues its commitment to become a nonnuclear state. Kazakhstan has done the same. Belarus has done the same. We and the Russians have negotiated two major nuclear reduction treaties, and we are not pointing our weapons at one another. I think it is unlikely that that will be reversed. You never can say "never," but I think it is unlikely. So the prospect of total destruction of two great civilizations arising out of a conflict which triggers nuclear war I think is very remote now, thanks in no small measure to this man and what he did.

Now, the second thing is, how likely is it that out of frustration with the pace and the pain of economic and political reform in Russia, the Russian people will turn to leaders who will say the best way to go for the future is to find greatness the way we found it in the past, by the reimposition of some sort of empire, that if we had an empire we would be viewed as a greater nation and we would be a richer nation, and your life would be better? Anyone would have to say that given how many people are saying that in Russia, that is somewhat more likely. All I can say is that we have to—as Chairman Shevardnadze said, that is a question the Russian people will have to answer for themselves.

My job is to try to do what I can to demonstrate that it is in the interests of the Russian people to define themselves as a nation

and to define their greatness in terms that will be appropriate to the 21st century, not to the 19th century and the early 20th century. And that is the best I can do, in my great hope.

Mark [Mark Halperin, ABC News].

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, as part of your commitment to fully cooperate with the Special Counsel, will you instruct your staff that you don't wish to invoke attorney-client privilege or executive privilege, and will you ask them not to, in preparing for a grand jury, invoke the fifth amendment? And if you ask them to do that, do you see any conflict between their individual rights and your attempt, your commitment to get all of the information out?

The President. Well, I can't answer any of those questions because I haven't even thought about it. I mean, I'm telling you, no one I know, no one I have talked to believes anything violative of any law has occurred by anybody. I mean, a lot of these hypothetical questions which have been raised have been literally bewildering to me based on my understanding of the facts. And again, I will say I refer you to what Sam Dash said last night: This administration is cooperating with the Special Counsel.

When I finally realized it was—the only way to continue the work of the administration would be to have one, I was happy to have one. Even though arguably on the evidence, the criteria for having one weren't met, I was still glad to do it so that we could go on with our work. And the only thing I ask you to do is, if you can become satisfied that we are fully cooperating and that we now have procedures in place which will prohibit any improper contact of any kind and there is no evidence that any improper influence was sought to be exercised by me or anybody else over any official decision, then let the Special Counsel to its job so that we can go forward with the work of the American people. That is the important thing we have to do.

Has anybody not had a question, any of the Ukraine press not had a question—I mean, Georgian press. I'm sorry. He told me

to mention something about Ukraine; I forgot. Maybe I'll remember in a minute.

Abkhazia

Q. I represent the Voice of America but Georgian service, broadcasting in Georgian language. And I would like to ask both the question. After the agreement that you reached about Abkhazia, you know that there are more than 250,000 refugees from Abkhazia from the atrocities and genocide there by Abkhaz separatists? And would you please answer me, do you think that it is enough, U.N. peacekeeping forces in Abkhazia to deploy to ensure, to guarantee the safety of Georgians in Abkhazia when they return back?

Chairman Shevardnadze. We discussed this with Mr. President Clinton in very, very great detail, all the aspects of the settlement of the Abkhazian conflict. I would even say that most of the time we dedicated to this issue. It seems to me that right now there is no other than a political way of solving this. There is just no other way. I am very appreciative to the President for the fact that he, in principle, gave his agreement to looking into this issue at the Security Council of the U.N., to have the U.N. send troops to that. This has a tremendously important meaning to Abkhazians, to Georgians, to the whole region.

I told you that I intend to come out and speak at the Security Council and explain to everyone there about my own views and my positions. Peacekeeping troops should have a certain mission. What I mean is, the safe return of refugees, guarantees of safety. Otherwise, there is no sense in sending peacekeeping forces, because new conflicts will start, new clashes.

So I think here we have a full mutual understanding with the President. It seems to me that tomorrow in my meetings with the Congressmen and Senators and other interested parties, I will be able to convince them of the way that this should be resolved. Everything else really depends on the Security Council.

Singapore

Q. Because we are broadcasting today and I think the Georgian audience will be very

thankful to you, to listen to your words in Georgia.

The President. Thank you very much.

I don't see Gene Gibbons [Reuters] here, but the last time we had a press conference here last week, he asked me about the young man in Singapore that was sentenced to a caning, and I told you that I did not know about it. I went back and immediately read the press report in, I think maybe it was the Los Angeles Times, one of the newspapers. And then I got a report from our national security staff. We have since filed a strong protest with the Government of Singapore. We recognize that they have a certain right to enforce their own criminal laws, but we believe that, based on the facts and the treatment of other cases, similar cases, that this punishment is extreme, and we hope very much that somehow it will be reconsidered.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President's 52d news conference began at 2:33 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Samuel Dash, professor of law at Georgetown University Law Center and former chief counsel and staff director for the Senate Watergate Committee. Chairman Shevardnadze spoke in Russian, and his remarks were translated by an interpreter.

Joint Declaration on Relations Between the United States and the Republic of Georgia

March 7, 1994

At their meeting at the White House, President of the United States Bill Clinton and Georgian Parliament Chairman Eduard Shevardnadze agreed on the need to accelerate the building of close and mutually beneficial relations on all levels between the United States of America and the Republic of Georgia.

The United States was the first country in which a Georgian Embassy was established after independence. This official visit by Chairman Shevardnadze marks an important further step demonstrating the significance which the United States and the Republic of Georgia attach to broadening and deepening their relationship.

The United States recognizes that the Republic of Georgia faces new challenges in ensuring its national security and is ready to work closely with Georgia to assist it in finding ways to meet these challenges. The United States and the Republic of Georgia further expressed their desire to facilitate contact between appropriate government officials with a view to broadening defense cooperation and expanding their dialogue on security issues of mutual interest.

The United States reaffirmed its full support for the territorial integrity of Georgia and pledged its continued backing for United Nations efforts to facilitate a peaceful settlement to the conflict in the Abkhaz region of Georgia.

International security can no longer be achieved through the efforts of individual states by acquiring ever increasing amounts of weaponry. Rather, security must be based on reduced levels of armaments among all nations, and on a multilateral commitment to uphold shared values, especially democracy, the inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, and peaceful resolution of disputes. The United States and the Republic of Georgia agreed that working together in multilateral institutions like CSCE and the North Atlantic Cooperation Council is an important means of promoting these goals and values.

The United States welcomes the announcement that the Republic of Georgia has decided to move forward on participation in NATO's Partnership For Peace. The Partnership provides a framework for enhanced political and operational military cooperation, including joint planning, training and exercises for multilateral crisis management activities.

The Republic of Georgia and the United States reaffirm their commitment to comply fully with the obligations of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe. The United States stands ready to provide technical assistance, advice, and expertise to assist the Republic of Georgia as it continues to meet these obligations. President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed that the two governments should continue to work together—and with other concerned governments—to explore ways to minimize the cost of meeting these commitments.

President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed that the independence of the Republic of Georgia and its commitment to democracy and market economic reform could make an important contribution to stability in a region of Europe that has known great tragedy and upheaval. The United States and the Republic of Georgia underscored their intention to cooperate actively to achieve this goal. The President and the Chairman agreed to protect and promote the values that bind together the democratic community of nations, including free and fair elections, freedom of emigration, the rule of law, respect for human rights, including free speech, free press, and respect for the rights of individuals belonging to minorities. The United States strongly supported the commitment of the Republic of Georgia to develop in full accordance with these principles and its efforts to build a just and stable society where the fundamental freedoms of all peoples are guaranteed.

The United States and the Republic of Georgia expressed their determination to advance the values of economic freedom, without which democracy cannot succeed and prosperity cannot be attained. The Republic of Georgia reaffirmed its determination to build a market economy through appropriate macroeconomic stabilization policies and structural reforms to promote market development, economic recovery and growth, and to create conditions attractive to foreign investment, which will contribute to the restructuring of the Georgian economy. The United States will assist the Republic of Georgia to promote economic reform, free trade and foreign investment. Both sides recognize the importance of improved market access for their firms, and the need to ensure economic progress and to deepen economic cooperation.

President Clinton and Chairman Shevardnadze agreed to work together to remove all unnecessary barriers to bilateral trade and investment. The President and Chairman signed the U.S.-Georgian Bilateral Investment Treaty today. They also agreed on the advisability of completing preparations on a treaty to avoid double taxation.

The United States reaffirmed its intention to continue providing assistance to the Re-

public of Georgia in the areas of agriculture, food, medicine, fiscal and monetary policy, and other areas to promote reform in Georgia. The United States expressed its commitment to continue its assistance to the Republic of Georgia in meeting the needs of the persons displaced from the Abkhazia region of Georgia.

The United States and the Republic of Georgia are also ready to expand their relations in such areas as science, energy, culture, arts, education, law, sports, tourism, youth exchanges, and new information technology.

By agreeing to cooperate to advance common political, economic, and security interests, the United States and the Republic of Georgia have laid the foundation for a strong and diversified relationship.

Remarks to the American Society of Association Executives

March 8, 1994

Thank you very much, Bob, for that fine introduction. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the warm welcome. This is the biggest stage I've been on in quite a while. I'm told it's so big because you're having the Oak Ridge Boys tonight. That made me wish I'd been invited later instead of earlier. [*Laughter*] I want to thank your president, Bill Taylor, for the invitation to come here and Bob Elsner for that fine introduction, especially what he said about health care. I guess if it were easy, it would have been done a long time ago. I look out in this crowd and see many friends of mine from across the country. I saw my good friend Neil Offen, the president of the Direct Selling Association, a minute ago. And I've already spotted five or six people in the audience that I've known for years. I thank you all for inviting me here and for giving me a chance to talk about health care today.

I'd like to just begin by trying to put this very briefly in the context in which I view it as your President. I think my job is to do everything I can to help every American reach his or her God-given potential and to try to bring the American people together to make our country stronger. In other

words, even though you often don't read about it in these terms, the real purpose of our political system, when it's working properly, is to get people together and to get things done.

In the last year, we have been able to bring the deficit down, keep interest rates down, see economic growth come back into this country. In the last 3 months of last year we had the highest growth rate in a decade, the biggest increase in productivity from American workers in 8 years. If our budget is adopted, the one I have presented to the Congress, we'll have 3 years of decline in the Federal deficit for the first time since Harry Truman was President and the first real reduction in discretionary nondefense spending since 1969, if this budget is adopted. At the same time, we're moving the money around so we'll be investing more in Head Start, more in medical research, more in new technologies to support defense conversion and to rebuild the American economy. We are beginning to turn this situation around and to make this Government work for the American people.

But this year we have a lot of other challenges we are facing. The Congress is working on a very important crime bill to put more police officers on the street, to stiffen penalties appropriately, to provide alternative punishments to first-time youthful offenders, to provide some ways for kids to stay out of jail, to take assault weapons off the street. They're doing a lot of important things. That's a big issue. And the Congress is dealing with that as we speak.

The Congress will take up welfare reform, a subject on which I have worked for well over a decade now. And I hope they finally will make welfare a second chance, not a way of life, for all Americans and enable us to bring children up in a better fashion. The Congress is going to have a chance now to finally pass a campaign finance reform bill, which will increase the confidence of the American people in the way we do our business here, and a lobby reform bill.

There are a lot of issues out there. But I can tell you that if over the long run we expect the American people to be a stronger community, if we expect our economy to have the funds necessary to invest in the

growth opportunities of the 21st century, and if you want your Federal Government to be able to respond to the challenges of today and tomorrow, we must address the health care crisis. It is not just a problem for individual American workers and families, it is a problem for the Federal budget and for the national investment patterns.

I can tell you, just to give you two examples, in addition to the fact that almost every American, at least those who don't work for larger businesses or for the Government, is at some risk of losing his or her health insurance or of having the inability to change jobs because someone in the family got sick, and almost every small business is at risk of having their premiums explode or their deductibles and copays explode, you also should know that this is a serious competitive problem for us. We are spending 14.5 percent of our income on health care. The Germans are just a little bit over 8 percent of their income. That's about where the Japanese are. Only the Canadians are at 10 percent of their income. If you think about spotting our competitors 5½ cents on every dollar spent, that is a significant issue. And almost all of you represent a group of business people who have personally experienced that. And as this economy becomes more global, that will become more relevant.

Now, should we spend more money than other countries on health care? I would argue we should and we must, because we invest more in medical research and technology. And we lead the world in that, and that generates jobs, opportunities, and incomes. We have these great academic health centers. Every American, just about, would be happy to pay a premium for that. Must we spend more? The answer to that is, yes, we must; as long as we have higher rates of violence and AIDS and teen pregnancy than other countries, we'll have higher bills. Does that account for all of the difference? Not even close. Not even close. A lot of it is directly related to the way we finance health care.

The second big problem you should know is this: In the budget we are adopting, we are cutting defense this year for the first time since 1969. If my budget's adopted, we'll cut nondefense spending. Social Security will go up, but only by the rate of inflation, and it's

paid for by the Social Security taxes, which are in surplus. We'll have to pay more on interest on the debt as it accumulates, although not as much as we would if interest rates weren't low. The only thing in this whole budget that is really going up by more than the rate of inflation in the Federal budget is health care costs, 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation. And if we don't do something about it, then the rising cost of Medicare and Medicaid will mean that 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, none of you, no matter whom you represent, will be able to come to Washington and say, "How about a new airport, how about a new port, how about a new highway program? How about a new technology investment? How are you going to keep up with our foreign competitors in the seven, eight areas of new technology that will control the future?" because we will be spending all of the money you give us in revenues on health care, while we cut everything else.

This is a huge problem. And I believe that after 60 years of false starts, we actually have an opportunity to do the right thing, that is, to give every American and every American family health security and have it be the right thing for the American economy and for the future of the United States.

For individuals, health security means freedom from fear and the freedom to prosper and the freedom to make choices that now are becoming narrower and narrower for most Americans in health care. For the Nation, it means the ability to bring health care costs within inflation, to have the chance finally to control the deficit, and to allow many businesses now struggling with this problem to be able to invest, to become more productive without having to make the decision to basically terrify their own employees by cutting back health care so much. Is this an easy problem? No. Does anybody have all the answers? No. If it were easy and someone had all of the answers, it would have been done before.

You represent more than 22,000 members who serve millions of Americans, tens of millions of Americans, engineers and teachers, pharmacists and farmers and bankers and Red Cross volunteers. Those are the kind of people served by the American Society of Association Executives. Next year you will turn

75, and for three-quarters of a century you have shown the importance of representation, of what can be done when people honestly seek to represent the genuine interest and feelings of their members and come together in a spirit of fairness and openness and try to achieve a common goal.

Well, I feel that I almost ought to be a member of this group. I could have a little tag that said the "Association of All the American People." [Laughter] And the members of my group want us to deal with the health care problem, and we're trying to do it. The American people want health care to be there when they need it, and they want it to be there at a reasonable price. That's what health insurance used to mean, what it can mean again.

I know that because of the opposition of various interest groups and because some of them have changed their position under withering political heat, there are some who have already said, "Well, we won't get health care reform; yet again, the people against it will prevail." Well, I say to the naysayers and the pessimists that, not quite so fast. I have seen a lot of endeavors in which I was involved over the last 15 years given up for dead, including my own endeavors, political endeavors. But it's a funny thing about our system here in America. The American people and their representatives, in the end, more than half the time, do the right thing when given the chance. Congress is starting today. I don't know how many Members of the Congress I've had tell me privately in the last week that they are actually becoming more optimistic that we will get a genuine health reform bill out that will provide health security to all Americans.

The reality is, and everyone knows this, that while we have the best health care in the world, people who have health insurance today might not have it tomorrow. People who can afford it today might not be able to afford it tomorrow. People who have choices with which they are satisfied today might lose all those choices tomorrow. Pre-existing conditions today leave 81 million Americans at risk. It means they can be denied coverage or their rates can be raised or they can't leave the job they've got for

a new one because they won't be able to carry insurance with them.

A lot of you represent small businesses. A lot of people would like to leave a bigger business and start their own business or might want to seek a better career opportunity that is in a smaller business than the one in which they are in. But if they have some member of their family that's been sick, they're literally trapped where they are, and they cannot do that. Three out of four Americans have lifetime limits on their policies which means that, for many of them, they can lose their coverage just when they need it the most. Two million families lose their health insurance every month, 100,000 of them permanently. We've seen an increase in the number of Americans without health insurance from 37 to 39 million just in the last 2 years.

The health care we have is good, if we can get it. But the health care financing system does not serve the American people well. It is broken. It is unfair. It leads to massive cost-shifting. It leads to, by far, the biggest paperwork burden of any health care system in the world. And I would like to say in simple terms what I believe we should do to fix it.

First, we should guarantee private insurance to every American. Second, we should guard the right to choose a doctor and improve the quality of health care plans. Third, we should limit how much insurance companies can raise rates based on whether your business is large or small or you work for the government, whether you're older or younger or whether someone in your family has been sick. And we should make it illegal for people to drop others. But we must set up a system in which insurance companies themselves will not be forced into bankruptcy if we make it illegal to drop them, which is why it is important for people to be able to be insured in large pools. Third, we want to protect and improve Medicare and health care for older Americans. Fourth, we want to provide benefits through the workplace, because that's where 9 of 10 Americans who have insurance already get it.

Now, that's the approach. It's not complicated, although millions have been spent

to make people think it is complicated; it is not all that complicated. It uses what works today to fix what's wrong today.

I know that a lot of people have seen this health security card. Don't leave home without it. [Laughter] But if you know how to use a credit card or a bank card or a Social Security card, people can figure this out. Under the system we have proposed, every American would get a card which stands for not a Government program but guaranteed private insurance and private health providers. The card would permit every American to choose a health care plan, to choose a doctor, to fill out one simple form, and to get health care for a whole year. And at the end of the year, Americans would be able to pick another plan or stay with the same plan or make a different decision. It would not stop any American, over and above that, from paying another private physician for some other service if that was desired. It would, in other words, give more choice than half the American work force has today in their health care plan.

Beginning by guaranteeing private insurance for all means that everyone must be covered. That's not only the only way to guarantee security, it's the only way to stop cost-shifting. As long as an insurance company can deny coverage or drop from coverage, then no one is really secure, and some Americans will have to pay the price for other Americans' health care because those who don't have insurance will eventually get health care when it is too late and too expensive, often at an emergency room. And then the cost will be passed on to all the rest of you who are paying for your health care right now in the usual way.

That is why I have said that I cannot sign and, indeed, would have to veto a bill that pretended to reform the health care system without providing a system by which everyone is covered. Because unless everyone is covered, there is no cost control, there is no end to cost-shifting, there is no real security, and there is no balance in the system. We are the only country in the world that hasn't figured out how to do this with an advanced economy, and we ought to be smart enough to do it. I mean, basically when I see all these ads that say we can't do it, I say, these people

are telling me my country is dumber than these other countries. I don't believe that. Or they are telling me that the price of having great health care and great teaching hospitals and great medical research and extraordinary technology is that you have to have some people who don't have anything and all the rest of us have to pay for that besides. I don't believe that. That cannot be true.

The benefits package ought to be comprehensive enough to encourage primary and preventive health care, because that saves money over the long run. That's a very important part of this. You think about it: Immunizations, mammograms, physicals, prescription drugs, all those things actually avert our health care costs when properly done and keep us healthier. We spend too much time in America treating people when they are sick and not enough time keeping people healthy in the first place.

Secondly, we want to preserve and enhance choice as the best guarantee that the quality of American medicine will remain the best in the world. People should be able to choose on their doctors and their health care plans; it guarantees quality. Under our proposal now, everyone would have a chance to make at least one from among three choices, at a minimum, every year. You could choose traditional fee-for-service medicine; you could choose an HMO, for example; you could choose a preferred provider organization that physicians and others organized themselves. But every year you would be given the chance, once again, to make that choice under our proposal. This is important. More and more people under the pressures of the present system are living with shrinking choices. And a lot of people are quite properly worried that those shrinking choices will not only interfere with their choice but will interfere with the quality of health care.

There have been a lot of articles written in thoughtful publications in the last few months pointing out that choice is a rapidly vanishing facet of American health care today, and that in fact the attack on our plan as limiting choice is simply not true; that by guaranteeing at least three choices and that you get to make a decision every year again, that we are building into this system a higher level of choice and therefore a guarantee of

competition and quality that otherwise would not be the case.

Now, the other thing that I want to say about this system is that affordable insurance should be there and should not be able to be taken away. That's why we want to make it illegal for rates to be raised unreasonably or for coverage to be dropped based on age or previous condition of illness. And we know that in order to do that and be fair to the private insurance companies, we have to let people be in large pools. That is, this is what all of you know as community rating. That's the only way you can guarantee that small businesses and self-employed people and farmers, for example, through some sort of cooperative system, can have access to the same good rates that people in big business and Government do, still have community rating, not discriminate against the old, not discriminate against the worker who's had a sick child or a spouse with cancer, and not bankrupt the insurance companies. If they're going to be able to be a part of this, you have to have some system of community rating.

These steps are very important. They put the control of the health care system of America back into the hands of the American people on the one hand and health care providers on the other. Today, the control is determined by the financing, and it is in the hands of the insurance companies. And very often they do what they do because of the way we are all organized and divided, so that even if they don't want to do something that has a harmful effect, the economics of their business dictate it because of the way the system is set up.

We can't permit that to go on anymore. The American people should have the power to choose. The American health care providers should have the power to deliver. There should be incentives to control cost through competition and requiring people to take some responsibility for their own health care. But it should not be organized the way it is now so that the people who are providing the financing in the middle have all the control and themselves are in a position not to make it fairer for many people. We cannot have the security of millions of our people in jeopardy, with a system that they are basi-

cally satisfied with when they have it but which could vanish overnight.

Another thing I want to say, because there have been a lot of questions about this, is that there's another part of our system we shouldn't mess up: Medicare is one of the best things about American health care because it works and has very low administrative costs, providing health security for millions of older Americans. The question is, how do we keep Medicare healthy as our population gets older? The fastest growing group of Americans in percentage terms are people over 80—hope to be one of them before long. *[Laughter]*

But how are we going to do that? How are we going to take care of our own as health care costs keep rising? We believe that we have to keep Medicare but that we have to recognize that the present system is heavily tilted toward institutionalized care which will (a) not be necessary for some people and (b) which will be explosively expensive as the percentage of our people living in higher age brackets goes higher and higher and higher. So our system, number one, covers prescription medicine along with Medicare, which Medicare doesn't do now—because we believe there is ample evidence that that keeps people healthier and will save money over the long run; a year's worth of medicine might cost the same thing as a day or two in a hospital—and secondly, by beginning to phase-in a long-term care system where we give people some help for making noninstitutional choices, for keeping their parents at home or finding adult day care centers or having in-home care. Because otherwise, you're looking at a population, by the turn of the century and the end of the first decade of the next century, which we simply cannot afford to maintain and would be bad for our country, unless we have more different options to deal with this rapidly aging population.

So under our proposal, if you get Medicare you keep it, which also includes the doctor of your choice and medical security. We achieve some savings in the Medicare program by bringing the rate of inflation in Medicare down to twice the rate of normal inflation. When you hear there are all these cuts in Medicare, don't believe it. We're just

going to bring the rate of inflation down to twice the normal rate of inflation and take those savings to pay for prescription medicine and to pay for the beginnings of a new and more comprehensive long-term care system. This is, again, terribly important. We cannot do anything to mess up health care security for older people. But we must strengthen it.

Finally, I think we should guarantee these benefits at work. And this is, after all, among the organized folks the most controversial decision of all. Nine out of ten Americans who have private insurance get it at work. Eight out of ten Americans who don't have any insurance have someone in their family who works. Expanding the present system lets us reach out to most of the uninsured and is based on shared responsibility. It is the easiest and simplest way to accomplish the goal. It's also the right thing to do. You can never stop cost-shifting until everybody's got insurance.

Consider this—I just mentioned welfare reform earlier—if we take a welfare mother with two little kids who says, “I hate welfare, and I want to get off of it, and I want to support my children,” and you give that fine person job training, and then the woman finds a job. And she goes to work for a small business at an entry-level pay slot, because she got a very limited education, and no health care benefits at the office. And that woman goes from getting a welfare check to getting a paycheck; she begins to pay taxes. She is now paying taxes for someone who made a different decision, who stayed on welfare to keep getting Medicaid, the Government-funded health care program for poor people, which she has given up to go to work. That, by the way, is the central reason that we're having some difficulty moving people from welfare to work. People don't want to hurt their children. Again, this is a system that no other country has. So we have to find a way to do it.

Now you say, well, but it's really tough on restaurants who have a lot of young people who are healthy and who don't want to pay for health insurance anyway. Or it's tough on people who have a lot of part-time workers. Some do and some don't; UPS has over 100,000 part-time workers and insures them

all. But you say, it's tough on businesses with part-time workers, and it's certainly tough on small businesses that are eking by. But that is why we reasoned that if we do this, we have to give substantial discounts for small businesses with low average payrolls, low profit margins, difficult times. There are big discounts written into this bill for just that purpose. And the self-employed, for the first time, under our bill, get 100 percent tax deductibility, not limited tax deductibility as they do now. These things will make this insurance more affordable, plus which, if small businesses and self-employed people are in larger pools, they will not be paying higher rates as they do now.

One reason small business people have to either not cover their folks or reduce coverage every year is that the average small business premium is 35 percent higher than the average government premium or big business premium. And you can't blame people for doing something in the face of those kinds of economics.

Another reason is, as a restaurant owner told me—the other day I was in Columbus, Ohio, and this restaurant owner said to me, “Look, I'm getting the worst of all worlds. I have 20 employees full-time and 20 part-time. And I was sick 5 years ago, so our rates went up.” It was an eating establishment. She says, “I cover my 20 full-time employees. I don't cover the part-time employees. I feel guilty that I don't cover the part-time employees and mad that my competitors don't cover the full-time employees, and I'm having to pay higher rates because we had one person, me, in our group of 20 that was sick.” So the rates go up, and the deductibles go up. She said, “I'm getting the worst of all worlds, too high insurance, my competitors have an advantage because I'm covering my employees and they aren't covering theirs, and I feel just terrible that the part-timers don't get any insurance at all.” She said, “I would gladly do it all if everybody were treated the same way and we had access to competitive rates.”

So I would argue that this is still the fairest and best way to make sure everyone is covered, discounts for smaller business, full deductibility for the self-employed, and a system which permits us to overcome the dis-

crimination in rates that small business endures today.

So again, this is a private health care system; it builds on what has worked; it is not more Government and more bureaucracy. It uses what's right about the American system, the health care, and fixes what is wrong, the financing. It guarantees permanent private insurance, safeguards the right to choose a doctor and a plan, limits how much rates can be raised because of categories and makes it illegal for people to be dropped, protects and improves Medicare and the health care of senior citizens, and provides health benefits to the workplace.

Now, the largest associations of America's family physicians, pediatricians, nurses, and pharmacists have supported this health care plan. Our approach was not designed to hurt anyone. It did have to make some difficult choices. It was designed for the American people. It was about giving life to our best values and dealing with one of our biggest problems. It was about giving families who work hard and do their best to raise their kids the security they deserve; stopping people from paying more because of the irresponsibility of others; stopping a situation in which 8 million older Americans, every month, who are not poor enough to be on the Medicaid program but are on Medicare and have to have medicine every month, 8 million, choosing between food and medicine. It was, in short, about dealing with a problem that is only going to get worse unless we fix it now and doing it in a way that does not interfere with what is finest about our health care system. It's about, ultimately, the freedom of the American people to be free from fear, the freedom to preserve choice, the freedom to preserve quality, and the freedom to grow and prosper into the 21st century, putting our values to work and believing that it is irrational to say that we can't do something that our competitors have figured out how to do.

That's why I think this year we will give every American the freedom that only real health care security can mean. I would encourage you to participate in this outreach, to respond to your communities, the people you honorably represent, not to agree with every jot and tittle of everything in the plan

we have presented. If we involve thousands of people and work for months and we know how complicated this is, but the basic things we have to do are fairly simple and straightforward. And we ought not to be in a great political campaign to maneuver symbols here. We ought to be involved in a great national debate of the American family to produce results that will genuinely solve this problem.

And so, my fellow Americans, let me end where I began. You represent an awful lot of the American family. You know how the people you represent would be affected by certain changes that were made. The Congress is beginning to debate in earnest. I ask you to support health security for all Americans. I ask you to support doing it through the workplace. I ask you to support preserving Medicare and preserving choice and giving small business people and self-employed people a break. I ask you to support those things. I ask you to enter into this debate and help us to fashion a plan that will meet those objectives. I ask you to do it with a good spirit, with a fair heart, with a sense of commitment to this, because you cannot succeed over the long run with the particular objectives of your group and we cannot succeed over the long run as a whole people unless we face this.

If we had done it earlier, it would have been less complex and easier. We'd still have problems with the health care system, the problems with this never go away in any country, but at least it would not have us by the throat, financially and emotionally. We can do this, we can do it this year, and we ought to do it. People like you will speak not with one voice on the details, but with one voice on the urgency of the mission.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. at the Washington Convention Center. In his remarks, he referred to Bob Elsner, chairman, American Society of Association Executives, and country music entertainers the Oak Ridge Boys.

Proclamation 6656—Irish-American Heritage Month, 1994

March 8, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

The patchwork quilt of United States history is intricately woven with the many great deeds and memorable contributions of Irish Americans. Since the founding of our country, immigrants from the Emerald Isle have shared in weaving the fabric of a new nation. And it is in no small part their efforts that have made America a land of both unparalleled diversity and infinite promise.

Fleeing the Great Potato Famine of the 19th century, hundreds of thousands of Irish immigrants joined their cousins in the new world. They arrived to face the considerable challenges of an unfamiliar territory with untamed resources and a brewing conflict over the nature of freedom and self-governance. Yet these brave pioneers—our grandparents and great-grandparents—were filled with hope and a vision of a better life. From John F. Kennedy to Tip O'Neill, George M. Cohan to Flannery O'Connor, Irish Americans have graced our political and cultural life with a spirit born of the courage and idealism inspired by their ancestors.

Today, well over 200 years since the American colonies declared their independence, Irish Americans and people everywhere are again filled with hope. After centuries of conflict, we are deeply encouraged by the prospect for peace in Northern Ireland. We look forward to a day in the near future when the Irish strength of character and faith in justice bring lasting peace to this troubled land—a day when their love for harmony overtakes the differences between religious traditions.

As we celebrate the vital bonds between our two great nations, I reaffirm my call for an end to all violence in Northern Ireland. In the great tradition of our common heritage, the people of the United States renew our pledge to the people of Ireland, rededicating ourselves to fostering understanding, cooperation, and peace.

In tribute to all Irish Americans, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 119, has designated March 1994 as "Irish-American Heritage Month" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this month.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim March 1994 as Irish-American Heritage Month. I urge all Americans to observe this month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:38 p.m., March 8, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on March 10.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting March 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19(3) of Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-356), I transmit herewith the report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 8, 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report on the Trade Agreements Program March 8, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1994 Trade Policy

Agenda and 1993 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 8, 1994.

**Remarks Announcing the
Appointment of Lloyd Cutler as
Special Counsel to the President and
an Exchange With Reporters**

March 8, 1994

The President. Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to announce the appointment of Lloyd Cutler as Special Counsel to the President, a position I know he will fill with distinction.

Lloyd Cutler is a fitting person to fill this important role. He was Counsel to President Carter, a leading member of the American bar, one of our foremost experts on issues of governance, ethics, and the Presidency, a person who has demonstrated throughout his career an abiding commitment to the values and to the ethic of public service.

In Lloyd Cutler, the White House has secured the service of a man of seasoned judgment, impeccable professional credentials, and the highest ethical standards. He'll provide a firm, uncompromising, and steady hand in a position of the utmost importance to me and to my administration.

In selecting a new Counsel, the criterion of greatest importance to me was that we find an eminent lawyer who could step into the role immediately and bring to the job the stature, the standards, and the experience that the American people expect. In short, I wanted a Lloyd Cutler-type of lawyer, so I just decided I would go to the original first and see how I could do.

There is nothing more important to me or to this administration or to our ability to carry out the agenda of change and renewal that brought us here than to secure, maintain, and deserve the trust of the American people. Throughout my career, I have been committed to the highest standards of public service, and so has Lloyd Cutler. I'm glad he has been willing to answer the call to service once again.

In welcoming him to the White House, I also want to again express my deep gratitude for the service that Bernie Nussbaum rendered this administration. His leadership contributed markedly to the appointments of Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Attorney General Janet Reno, the FBI Director, Louie Freeh, and, I believe, the best qualified and clearly the most diverse group of American Federal judges in our history. I will always be grateful for that service and for his friendship.

While Lloyd Cutler will play an important role in maintaining the highest ethical conduct in this administration, let me emphasize this point: On ethics, as with every other issue, it is the President who must set the standard. At this stage in his career, a stage at which no one would have blamed him for resting on his laurels and resisting this entreaty, Lloyd Cutler has chosen once again to roll up his sleeves and to serve his country. And for that, I thank him.

Welcome back to the White House.

Lloyd Cutler. Mr. President, I am honored by this appointment, and I will do my best to serve you and the country. And I am especially honored to have the opportunity to serve under this President who has already accomplished so much in just a short year and has so much promise of achievements to come.

This is hardly the way I expected to spend the spring of 1994. I am a senior citizen, you can see, and from direct experience, I know the intensity and the rigors of this job. And I have, therefore, limited my commitment with the President's permission—I had to negotiate hard for it—to a period of months.

The role of White House Counsel has many aspects, but I intend to concentrate on what the President just told you is his goal, that the procedures and the actions necessary to maintain public confidence in the integrity and the openness of the Presidency. In Government, as in other aspects of life, trust is the coin of the realm. And Mr. President, I pledge myself to do what I can to assure that that trust is maintained.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us about other contacts that your aides have acknowl-

edged now that emerged through the document search, and the interviewing that had apparently taken place between regulators and White House officials, and what you know about it? And secondly, can you tell us whether you will agree to Mr. Leach's request that your Chief of Staff and other top officials testify before the House Banking Committee?

The President. First, let me say that based on what we know, based on what we know now—and remember I asked everybody to go find out everything they could find out—any contacts were incidental and were follow-up conversations which had nothing to do with the substance of the RTC investigations. This, like everything else, is an issue on which we intend to cooperate fully with the Special Counsel. We welcome his inquiry. We want to clear the air, and we will do that.

With regard to the question of hearings, maybe I ought to let Mr. Cutler respond to that since it's the first thing we'll be dealing with. But we have discussed it, and I am fully in accord with his recommendations. So maybe I should let him—

Q. [Inaudible]—recommendations?

Mr. Cutler. Well, as I understand it, at this point, the Special Counsel has requested the congressional committees not to hold hearings, and that request is still under consideration by the House Banking Committee. But if the House Banking Committee should decide to ask the list of people who Mr. Leach has identified to testify, it would be my recommendation that everyone in the White House cooperate.

Q. How will you handle your own personal divestiture from your law firm, conflict of interest issues for yourself? Are you going to go through the usual recusal that a White House Counsel who would stay a long time would go through?

Mr. Cutler. Yes, I am, Rita [Rita Braver, CBS News].

Q. Mr. President, do you think you made a mistake by not bringing in Washington insiders into your administration in the first place, since you obviously, every time there's a crisis, you'll fall back on them? And while I have the floor, Senator Dole has said that congressional Republicans will campaign against Democrats if you don't go along with

holding hearings. I know that won't come as a surprise, but—

The President. Let me answer the first question first. I think that when we started out this administration, we had a lot of Washington experience in the Cabinet and not as much in the White House. And I think that the culture here and the whole procedures here are quite different than they are in most any other place in the country. And I think it's something we have to be very sensitive to.

I also think, as I said before and I'll say again, it's important for me that I have a high level of confidence in the procedures, that the way we're operating is the right way to operate, and that you have a high level of confidence in the procedures. Because I can tell you, I'm not going to do anything to abuse my authority. I'm not going to knowingly ever do anything to undermine the respect of the American people for the Presidency. And I think Lloyd Cutler can help us to do that.

Now, on the question of what Senator Dole said, I will just remind all of you one more time that it was all the Republicans who were clamoring for a Special Counsel—clamoring, saying this is all we want. And then all of you wanted it. And all I've tried to do is to cooperate fully with the Special Counsel and to let the Special Counsel do his job. If the Republicans are finally being honest that they want to make political hay out of this and that that's their real concern, I think the American people have noticed that a long time ago. I think it is obvious to them. And I think that it's not for me to give them political advice, but I do not believe that the politics of personal destruction is what the American people are interested in.

I am cooperating. I am not doing what some people have done in the past. I am cooperating. I am being open. I'm going to work to make this whole process a success, and I'm going to let the other people do and say whatever they want to do.

Q. Mr. President, does your recruitment of a Lloyd Cutler say something about at least the perception of a lapse of ethical judgment?

The President. Well, I think, you know, maybe I ought to let, again, Mr. Cutler say

something about that. I do not have any information that anyone has done anything wrong, that anyone has tried to use the authority of the White House in any way, shape, or form. And I can tell you for darned sure, I haven't. And I would—there's a difference in perception and—perception is something like beauty; it's in the eye of the beholder. And as I said, one of the things that I want to do is to make sure that we have procedures here where there will be no doubt of that. I think we've already done that by constructing a firewall so that we can't have information even coming in to us, even if our people are passive recipients of it, unless it is an appropriate thing to do. And I think Mr. Cutler agrees that it was the right thing to do.

Q. The First Lady is quoted in a magazine interview today as ascribing the Whitewater matter to what she calls a, quote, "well-organized and well-financed attempt to undermine my husband and by extension myself." She isn't any more specific than that. Would it now be appropriate, sir, for her to hold a news conference to explain what she means by that and to answer questions about her role in this and other matters, sir?

The President. I think I'll let her speak for herself, but I think surely it has not escaped you that this is not a disorganized set of comments we're getting out of the Republicans, that this happened over a long period of time, and that the nature of that has not been looked into with anything like the intensity or longevity of the matter itself. But no, I think her words speak for themselves. She's perfectly capable of speaking for herself.

Q. Well, could I follow up by asking Mr. Cutler if that's what he thinks is behind this whole matter, and that's the problem he's trying to rectify?

Mr. Cutler. I think I'll stick to giving legal advice.

Q. Mr. President.

The President. Yes.

Q. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, D'Amato, was on the Senate floor this morning, and despite your passionate defense of the First Lady yesterday, he said, specifically referring to Mrs. Clinton, quote, "Were you briefed by your Chief of Staff, Maggie Williams, about her meeting with Roger Altman, the Deputy Secretary of the

Treasury, and did you know it was wrong?" Do you know if Mrs. Clinton was briefed by Maggie Williams about that meeting that Roger Altman had here at the White House?

The President. Is Senator D'Amato aware that there was an ethics council opinion that the meeting was not improper? Maybe the ethics council was wrong. Look, the Republicans have decided that Senator D'Amato will be the ethical spokesman for the Republican Party in the Congress. That is their right to do that. I'm not in the business of answering his questions. I am cooperating with the Special Counsel.

Gwen [Gwen Ifill, New York Times].

Q. Mr. President, when Bernie Nussbaum gave you his letter of resignation, he said that he felt that he was the victim of an unfair standard in Washington about what a lawyer should be to a President. I would like to ask you and Mr. Cutler whether you agree with Mr. Nussbaum's assessment.

The President. I think there is—I think all of us recognize—I saw where one of the Washington lawyers the other day said there was a curious navigation in this community between law and politics and the press about what is perceived to be ethical or not ethical. I think it is clear that I don't think Bernie Nussbaum thought for a minute he was doing anything wrong or thought for a minute he was doing anything other than trying to represent the President in a perfectly appropriate way.

We are looking into and the Special Counsel is going to look into the facts here. I don't want to comment about that. I can say that I do not believe that he thought that he was doing anything amiss.

Mr. Cutler. I've been a personal friend of Bernie Nussbaum's for quite a while. I talked to him when he first came down as Counsel. I agree with the President that Bernie has never had an unethical or improper thought or bone in his body. He must have believed that everything he did was entirely correct. And at least based on what I've read in the newspapers, it isn't at all clear that any of these meetings were called by him.

Q. I didn't hear——

Q. If I could just follow up——

Mr. Cutler. I said it is not clear that any of these meetings were initiated by him.

Q. Speaking more generally about the role of the Counsel, and whether the Counsel is supposed to be—whether the Counsel is unfairly held to a standard, when he says he's supposed to represent the President no matter what?

Mr. Cutler. The Counsel is supposed to be Counsel for the President in office and for the Office of the Presidency, as many people have said. Most of the time those two standards coincide. Almost always the advice you would give the President is advice that is in the interest of the Office of the Presidency. I don't think there is much of a dichotomy between the two. When it comes to a President's private affairs, particularly private affairs that occurred before he took office, those should be handled by his own personal private counsel and, in my view, not by the White House Counsel.

Q. May I follow up on that, sir? Without the benefit of hindsight, let's consider hypothetically, had you been White House Counsel, would you have raised some kind of flag about the meetings to which Mr. Nussbaum was privy? Do you think you would have?

Mr. Cutler. That's like, would you have passed on third down or would you have had a draw play. I don't want to get into that.

Q. Would that be clear in your mind? You would not know if it were clear in your mind?

Mr. Cutler. I'd have to know the facts and the circumstances, and I think Bernie Nussbaum had a lot of bad luck.

Q. Will you let such meetings go forward in the future then? Are you saying that this would be appropriate in the future?

Mr. Cutler. Steps have been taken to be sure that any such meeting in the future would be a meeting that the White House Counsel would decide whether to hold or not, and that is what has been done.

The President. Let me explain that, if I might. If you'll note that there was—I think the problem here, and this may go to the questions that all of you are asking, including the question Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International] asked, is that there was a certain—and your perception of it, I think, may be rooted in the fact that there was a certain kind of ad hoc quality to it. That is, what we should have had and what we now have is an organized firewall, so that an ad-

vance judgment would have to be made before every meeting and every telephone conversation by someone charged with the responsibility for making that judgment and someone with the requisite knowledge to make it. That, I think, is the problem, so that these things that don't just happen by happenstance in an area which is highly charged and of great public interest. I think that is the issue, is setting up a system.

We believe we now have a system that will work. So that if in the future you come to us and say, "Was there a meeting? Was there a conversation?" we'll be able to say, "No, there wasn't," or, "Yes, there was. Here's what happened. Here's who approved it. Here's why it occurred." Boom. And instead of having what happened happen, where everybody tries to go back and reconstitute, in effect, a set of things that just sort of occurred in serial fashion where there was no organized dealing with this, I think we have dealt with it now in an appropriate way. I don't think we will have this problem again.

Q. Mr. President, there have been any one of a number of aides or officials who have blamed a lot of the, whatever you want to call it, mess that we're dealing with here, as you've said, not on any sort of allegation of wrongdoing or criminal admission of a sort but on the way things were handled. You've talked about how this issue is going to be handled from here on out. Is anything going to change in the way the operation is done here that would guard against the way the White House handles issues of this sort so as to prevent another Whitewater from coming up?

The President. First of all, let's just talk about this. Now, remember, be careful when you use language. This White House has not initiated any effort to do anything improper. This White House has not attempted to cover up any information. We are uncovering information and making extraordinary efforts to do so. What we are trying to do is to have some daily procedures here that will—and systems that will guard against any misunderstandings of this kind in the future. Do we need some changes in the system? Is Lloyd Cutler the person to help us do that? I think the answer is yes. I think he understands how to strike the proper balance in what kind of

institutional changes we might have to undertake and just in the way we operate here so that the Office of the President and the President in office can both be properly represented.

Q. Could I follow that, sir? You have not even been accused of doing anything improper, and yet, look at the cost: diversion from your policies, from your message for weeks, if not months. Are you bitter about this, sir? And are we wrong for pursuing it the way we have? The press corps, I'm talking about.

The President. The answer is—am I bitter about it? No.

Q. Why not?

The President. Because I think as you grow older, bitterness is something you have to learn to put aside. As you strive to be more mature, one of the things you have to give up in life is your bitterness about everything. You have to work through that. That's part of my personal mission in life. It has nothing to do with being President, really.

I also think you can't be a very good President if you're consumed with bitterness. If I wake up every day all agitated about this, then I can't deal with the problems of the people. If I'm thinking about me, I can't be thinking about them. The American people hired me.

Now, you will have to make a judgment. The only thing I have—I will just reiterate what you said. I've still not been accused of anything wrong, because I haven't done anything wrong. And I'm not going to do anything wrong. I revere the responsibility that I have been given, and I am not going to abuse it.

Do I expect to learn something out of this? Do I expect Lloyd Cutler to bring something special to this White House and help us to then have a procedure that has the confidence of you and the American people? Yes, I do. I think we'll do better.

Do I think we're in danger of spending too much time on it? That's why I wanted the Special Counsel. If you'll go back, when I had said—I said, I'm for the Special Counsel. Let him do the job. Let us do that. Let's don't fill the airwaves talking about something that we need to draw definitive conclusions about, and that's what the Special

Counsel will do. And I hope earnestly that we can go back to doing just that. That's what is in the public interest, to let the Special Counsel do the job and not clutter up the public life of this country with something that's going to be clearly and firmly resolved, eventually.

Q. I'm a little bit confused with the procedures that have been in place since the start of your administration. They were reiterated after these meetings were discovered. I'm a little confused about what exactly in the next 6 months you expect Mr. Cutler to do, and maybe both you and he could talk about what you think he'll bring, other than the symbolism of his presence.

The President. First of all, the procedures have not been in place. We never had any—if you go back to the facts as we know them and based on what I know, based on what you know, based on what's been reported, we did not have a centralized system for saying, hey, all these issues, before there is any contact, even if all we're doing is responding to somebody else, there needs to be some central vetting point. That is a significant firewall that we have created that did not exist beforehand.

Maybe you want to say something else.

Mr. Cutler. In the future—and many of these processes have already been put into effect by the Deputy Counsel—in the future, whenever a question arises as to whether a particular meeting should be held or a communication should be made or received, relating to an investigation or an enforcement action concerning what we might call a high political person, someone in the White House or high in one of the Cabinet Departments, it will be the White House Counsel who will after careful reflection decide whether there should be such a meeting or a communication. And he will make a careful record of what happens so that it will be available if questions are raised later on.

There are many, many communications between the President and the President's lawyer. After all, the President is the enforcement official of the Executive branch. It is his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. And there are many entirely proper communications with the enforcement authorities about policy,

about cases being brought against third parties—about cases being brought, for example, against, let's say, a Republican Member of Congress—where the President might need a heads-up because it may be a big news event. All of those things are perfectly normal and perfectly proper and have always existed.

There are other cases where a meeting or a communication, either because no record is made—even though the communication was innocent, nobody can really prove what happened—there are many cases where it is inadvisable to have that kind of communication. And the decision will have to be made, and it will be made by the White House Counsel and the Deputy Counsel as to whether there should be a communication or not.

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on a question from yesterday that perhaps you've had a chance——

The President. Wait, let him go first.

Q. All right, I'm sorry.

Q. Mr. Cutler, you said that you will remain aboard for 130 days. But the special prosecutor seems to have taken rent out in Little Rock for a longer period of time. Would you reconsider, sir, staying longer if the case merits your presence here?

Mr. Cutler. I've put a limit on how long I would stay in part because I know how tough a job this is and I know how old I am, in part because I'm married fairly recently to a very young and peppy wife and I want to spend some more time with her. If something happens, I'll decide when the event comes. [Laughter]

The President. I can't compete with that. [Laughter]

Peter [Peter Maer, Westwood One Radio], go ahead.

Q. Thank you, sir. To follow up on a question that came up yesterday that perhaps you've had a chance to discuss with Mr. Cutler, have you decided whether you're going to be able to preclude invoking executive privilege and the lawyer-client relationship in response to all of these inquiries?

The President. Well, let me say this. I don't know that—obviously, I have no way of knowing what will come up. But it is hard for me to imagine a case in which I would

invoke it. In other words—again, I can't imagine everything that—it's difficult for me—I thought about it a little bit, and we've talked about it a little bit. My interest in here is to get the facts out, fix the procedures for the future, get the facts out about what was known here and what happened, and cooperate with the Special Counsel. So I can't—it's hard for me to imagine a circumstance in which that would be an appropriate thing for me to do.

Go ahead, Karen [Karen Ball, New York Daily News].

Q. You were covered by the subpoena for documents. Did you have any notes or memos or anything that you had to give to—to pass on to Mr. Fiske?

The President. I didn't in my possession. I told them that any notes I have—if I make any handwritten notes about any kind of conversations that occur to me, I give them all to—I would have given them to Mr. Podesta or someone in the White House to file in an appropriate way, so they can go look and see. I don't remember any that I have.

Q. You didn't search——

The President. I didn't because I don't have any in my briefcase that I take home at night or anything like that. I have no such documents.

Q. Are you saying, Mr. President, that you don't keep a diary?

The President. That's correct, I do not. I do not. We keep regular—we keep very detailed records, obviously, of people I meet with, telephone calls I make. Sometimes I make extra notes on meetings and extra notes on phone conversations, and when I do, I put those in a file. But I don't keep a regular diary in the sense you mean that, no, I don't.

Q. Are there any tape recordings of conversations made in the Oval Office?

The President. To the best of my knowledge, there are not. If there are, someone else made them, not the President.

Q. Mr. President, it's been 2 years since this story first emerged on the scene, almost exactly, I think, to the day. And since then, of course, it's gone out of public view, and then it's come back several times, now apparently bigger than ever. To what degree do you think that you and your White House

are responsible for the fact that this has now emerged bigger than ever?

The President. I don't know, because—I've done what I could to answer what I know about this. I don't know that—what I know about this—I don't know that anything new has happened in terms of the facts, except that there was the—whatever was happening about other people involving the S&L issue. But it's still what it always was; it's a real estate investment I made 15 years ago that I didn't make money on.

Q. But you don't think your staff and your White House bears any responsibility for the fact that this matter hasn't been put to rest?

The President. I don't know how we could put it to rest except—because no one has produced any credible evidence of any wrongdoing on our part. I don't know what we could do. I've tried to answer the questions that were asked.

Now, in this last flurry around what meetings were held or communications or conversations were held, that's a different issue, Carl [Carl Leubsdorf, Dallas Morning News]. That's—obviously, that raised a lot of flags for a lot of you, anyway. And we're trying to resolve that. But quite apart from that, we've tried to do what we could. We've given what records we had, first up to a Republican prosecutor who was appointed by the Attorney General, and then to the special prosecutor; we have pledged to fully cooperate. I simply don't know what else we could do. But I'm willing to try to do anything I can to be cooperative with the special prosecutor, and I will continue to do it.

Q. Mr. President, to follow up on the question from yesterday, someone asked you yesterday whether you had ever been briefed after the fact about these two meetings in question in the White House. You said you had not. Bruce Lindsey is one of your—

The President. No, no, wait a minute. Someone asked me if I had been briefed about—I think there were three issues, weren't there? There was a meeting about a press matter. Then there was the Altman meeting. Then there was a—I think there was a telephone call or something that said—about the RTC referral dealing with the question of whether my campaign might have been the beneficiary of a fundraiser

where the checks came out of an S&L. I think those were the three issues.

And I said that I had not been briefed on that. I did not know about the Altman meeting until he testified about it. I did not know about the press meeting until that whole discussion, until it became public. Some time in October, I do not remember when, I learned about the RTC referral. My clear—I don't even remember when or exactly how I learned about it, but my clear impression was that the RTC had made a referral on this, and I understood the issue, and I just absorbed it. I did nothing about it. I ordered no action to be taken. And I honestly don't remember what date it occurred.

Q. I didn't mean to be misleading on that question. The question I'd like to ask is, in one of these meetings that's become part of the controversy here, Bruce Lindsey attended one of those meetings. He is a long-time personal friend of yours and an adviser. What I'd like to know is whether Mr. Lindsey ever briefed you personally about any of those sessions?

The President. Which one was that?

Q. I believe it was the first one, but I cannot swear—the second one. It was the second meeting.

The President. The only thing that Bruce—Bruce is the person who—he might have—he probably is the person who told me about the RTC referral at some point in October. I say “probably”; I literally don't remember. All I remember is at some point in October I heard about it. And my clear impression was that that was an action the RTC had taken to make this referral, and it didn't seem—it was just something that I knew and absorbed. I didn't discuss it or ask anybody to do anything or take any action. That never occurred to me. It was just something that I was being given as a matter of information. And I didn't make any notes at the time about when I learned it. It was just something that I was told. And I'm sorry I can't remember more about it.

Q. Mr. President, are you doing, you or the White House doing anything to discourage the House Banking Committee from holding these hearings on March 24th that are planned? It's part of their semiannual re-

view into the RTC, and it's that plan that Representative Leach——

The President. That's a decision that the House Banking Committee and others in the House will have to make. It's not up to me.

Q. You're not——

The President. No, I—the only thing I will say is, again, I'm trying to cooperate with the Special Counsel. The whole idea was that we would lodge all this whole inquiry into the Special Counsel so that the rest of us here in Washington could go on with our business. The Special Counsel requested yesterday that hearings not be held. I think that is a request entitled to respect. If the Congress decides to ignore that request and to proceed, then I think that's something we would have to take very seriously. My inclination would be to obviously participate.

Q. Can you tell us how much time this investigation is taking of yours and to what extent this might be distracting from other——

The President. It's costing the taxpayers a fortune, of course, in terms of the Special Counsel as opposed to letting the Justice Department go forward. And it's costing all of you more, probably. But I have—obviously, I took a little time to prepare for this press conference, and I had discussed these matters in some detail. But I'm trying very hard to minimize how much time I have to spend on this. This is not what I was hired to do. I was hired to be President. And this relates to things that happened years ago, all the legal questions that are raised, and I'm just trying to cooperate. And I hope that the people who pushed so hard for the Special Counsel, principally the media and the Republicans, will also do the same thing, will let the Special Counsel do his job. That's what I think we ought to do. I don't need——

Q. But is it distracting?

The President. Is it distracting? Well, in the sense that I'm standing here talking to you about this instead of something else, it is. But you have to understand, I am very relaxed about this. I did not do anything wrong. There is nothing here. I made an investment, and I lost money, like a lot of other Americans. And that's all there is. I've never had anything to do with any kind of savings and loan. I didn't borrow any money. I didn't

invest in it. I didn't have anything to do with the decisions on it.

So I am perfectly at ease with this. I just want it to go on. I mean, the longer it goes on and the more money it costs and the more delay it is, the more it just has static—to go back to the question the gentleman asked earlier. But I just—my only position is, I want to cooperate. I want to be fully forthcoming. I want the American people to see that this White House is different. If there's a question here about conduct, we're open, not closed. There's no bunker mentality. But I think it's very important for the public interest that we let the process that has been established through the Special Counsel work.

Thank you very much.

Q. Can you clarify whether Mr. Cutler will be here 4 months or 6 months? How does that all work?

Q. And what's his salary?

The President. Let me answer—I think—first of all, we have not decided that you can add 130 work days and come up with 6 months and a half if you work a 5-day week and less if you work a 6-day week. But he has not used this—I want to emphasize what he said—he has not used this to evade the compliance with the ethics law. He's fully complying with all of them.

What we have agreed is that we would work real hard to make sure that we had the Counsel's office up and going and working in an appropriate way and that the procedures were working fine and that this matter and others were being handled in the best possible way and that at some point on the outer range, or a little bit closer to now, that he would consider his job done. But we don't have a fixed view of the time.

Q. So you'll look for a full-time Counsel during this period that he serves as the interim Special Counsel?

The President. Actually, we will look for someone to succeed him at the end of this tenure.

Q. Is he on full salary here? Are you on full salary?

The President. I don't know what he's—I haven't asked him. I mean, I haven't asked anybody. I assume we're paying him full salary.

Q. We were told that you might be waiving a salary.

Mr. Cutler. I wanted to serve without compensation. It's been suggested that I consider accepting the salary and donating it to the Treasury Deficit Fund, and we're considering that right now.

And on your other question, remember that the difficult we do immediately, the impossible takes a little longer. And I hope that very soon we can get on and get a fine, new, younger Counsel like Bob Strauss. [Laughs]

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:15 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Representative James A. Leach, House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee member; John D. Podesta, Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary; and Bruce R. Lindsey, Assistant to the President and Senior Adviser.

Executive Order 12902—Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation at Federal Facilities

March 8, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (Public Law 94-163, 89 Stat. 871, 42 U.S.C. 6201 *et seq.*) as amended by the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486, 106 Stat. 2776) and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, I hereby order as follows:

Part 1—Definitions

For the purposes of this order:

Section 101. The “Act” means the Federal energy management provisions of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended by the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Sec. 102. The term “comprehensive facility audit” means a survey of a building or facility that provides sufficiently detailed information to allow an agency to enter into energy or water savings performance contracts or to invite inspection and bids by private upgrade specialists for direct agency-funded energy or water efficiency investments. It shall include information such as the following:

(a) the type, size, energy use, and performance of the major energy using systems and their interaction with the building envelope, the climate and weather influences, usage patterns, and related environmental concerns;

(b) appropriate energy and water conservation maintenance and operating procedures;

(c) recommendations for the acquisition and installation of energy conservation measures, including solar and other renewable energy and water conservation measures; and

(d) a strategy to implement the recommendations.

Sec. 103. The term “cost-effective” means providing a payback period of less than 10 years, as determined by using the methods and procedures developed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8254 and 10 CFR 436.

Sec. 104. The term “demand side management” refers to utility-sponsored programs that increase energy efficiency and water conservation or the management of demand. The term includes load management techniques.

Sec. 105. The term “energy savings performance contracts” means contracts that provide for the performance of services for the audit, design, acquisition, installation, testing, operation, and, where appropriate, maintenance and repair, of an identified energy or water conservation measure or series of measures at one or more locations.

Sec. 106. The term “agency” means an executive agency as defined in 5 U.S.C. 105. For the purpose of this order, military departments, as defined in 5 U.S.C. 102, are covered under the auspices of the Department of Defense.

Sec. 107. The term “Federal building” means any individual building, structure, or part thereof, including the associated energy or water-consuming support systems, which is constructed, renovated, or purchased in whole or in part for use by the Federal Government and which consumes energy or water. In any provision of this order, the term “Federal building” shall also include any building leased in whole or in part for use by the Federal Government where the term of the lease exceeds 5 years and the lease

does not prohibit implementation of the provision in question.

Sec. 108. The term “Federal facility” means any building or collection of buildings, grounds, or structure, as well as any fixture or part thereof, which is owned by the United States or any Federal agency or which is held by the United States or any Federal agency under a lease-acquisition agreement under which the United States or a Federal agency will receive fee simple title under the terms of such agreement without further negotiation. In any provision of this order, the term “Federal facility” shall also include any building leased in whole or in part for use by the Federal Government where the term of the lease exceeds 5 years and the lease does not prohibit implementation of the provision in question.

Sec. 109. The term “franchising” means that an agency would provide the services of its employees to other agencies on a reimbursable basis.

Sec. 110. The term “gainsharing” refers to incentive systems that allocate some portion of savings resulting from gains in productivity to the workers who produce those gains.

Sec. 111. The term “industrial facilities” means any fixed equipment, building, or complex for the production of goods that uses large amounts of capital equipment in connection with, or as part of, any process or system, and within which the majority of energy use is not devoted to the heating, cooling, lighting, ventilation, or to service the hot water energy load requirements of the building.

Sec. 112. The term “life cycle cost” refers to life cycle cost calculated pursuant to the methodology established by 10 CFR 436.11.

Sec. 113. The term “prioritization survey” means a rapid assessment that will be used by an agency to identify those facilities with the highest priority projects based on the degree of cost effectiveness and to schedule comprehensive facility audits prior to project implementation. The prioritization survey shall include information such as the following:

(a) the type, size, energy and water use levels of the major energy and water using systems in place at the facility; and

(b) the need, if any, for acquisition and installation of cost-effective energy and water conservation measures, including solar and other renewable energy resource measures.

Sec. 114. The term “shared energy savings contract” refers to a contract under which the contractor incurs the cost of implementing energy savings measures (including, but not limited to, performing the audit, designing the project, acquiring and installing equipment, training personnel, and operating and maintaining equipment) and in exchange for providing these services, the contractor gains a share of any energy cost savings directly resulting from implementation of such measures during the term of the contract.

Sec. 115. The term “solar and other renewable energy sources” includes, but is not limited to, agriculture and urban waste, geothermal energy, solar energy, and wind energy.

Sec. 116. The term “utility” means any person, State, or agency that is engaged in the business of producing or selling electricity or engaged in the local distribution of natural gas or water to any ultimate consumer.

Part 2—Interagency Coordination

Sec. 201. Interagency Coordination. The Department of Energy (“DOE”) shall take the lead in implementing this order through the Federal Energy Management Program (“FEMP”). The Interagency Energy Policy Committee (“656 Committee”) and the Interagency Energy Management Task Force (“Task Force”) shall serve as forums to coordinate issues involved in implementing energy efficiency, water conservation, and solar and other renewable energy in the Federal sector.

Part 3—Agency Goals and Reporting Requirements for Energy and Water Efficiency in Federal Facilities

Sec. 301. Energy Consumption Reduction Goals. (a) Each agency shall develop and implement a program with the intent of reducing energy consumption by 30 percent by the year 2005, based on energy consumption per-gross-square-foot of its buildings in use, to the extent that these measures are cost-effective. The 30 percent reductions shall be measured relative to the agency’s 1985 energy use. Each agency’s implementation pro-

gram shall be designed to speed the introduction of cost-effective, energy-efficient technologies into Federal facilities, and to meet the goals and requirements of the Act and this order.

(b) Each agency shall develop and implement a program for its industrial facilities in the aggregate with the intent of increasing energy efficiency by at least 20 percent by the year 2005 as compared to the 1990 benchmark, to the extent these measures are cost-effective, and shall implement all cost-effective water conservation projects. DOE, in coordination with the 656 Committee, shall establish definitions and appropriate indicators of energy and water efficiency, and energy and water consumption and costs, in Federal industrial facilities for the purpose of establishing a base year of 1990.

Sec. 302. Energy and Water Surveys and Audits of Federal Facilities. (a) *Prioritization Survey.* Each agency responsible for managing Federal facilities shall conduct a prioritization survey, within 18 months of the date of this order, on each of the facilities the agency manages. The surveys shall be used to establish priorities for conducting comprehensive facility audits.

(b) *Comprehensive Facility Audits.* Each agency shall develop and begin implementing a 10-year plan to conduct or obtain comprehensive facility audits, based on prioritization surveys performed under section 302(a) of this order.

(1) Implementation of the plan shall ensure that comprehensive facility audits of approximately 10 percent of the agency's facilities are completed each year. Agencies responsible for managing less than 100 Federal facilities shall plan and execute approximately 10 comprehensive facility audits per year until all facilities have been audited.

(2) Comprehensive audits of facilities performed within the last 3 years may be considered current for the purposes of implementation.

(3) "No-cost" audits, such as those outlined in section 501(c) of this order, shall be utilized to the extent practicable.

(c) *Exempt Facilities.* Because the mission within facilities exempt from the energy and water reduction requirements under the Act may not allow energy efficiency and water

conservation in certain operations, actions shall be taken to reduce all other energy and water waste using the procedures described in the Act and this order. Each agency shall develop and implement a plan to improve energy and water efficiency in such exempt facilities. The prioritization surveys are intended to allow agencies to refine their designation of facilities as "exempt" or "industrial," so that only individual buildings in which industrial or energy-intensive operations are conducted remain designated as "exempt" or "industrial." Within 21 months of the date of this order, each agency shall report to FEMP and to the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") the redesignations that the agency is making as a result of the prioritization surveys. Agencies may seek exemptions for their facilities pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended.

(d) *Leased Facilities.* Agencies shall conduct surveys and audits of leased facilities to the extent practicable and to the extent that the recommendations of such surveys and audits could be implemented under the terms of the lease.

Sec. 303. Implementation of Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation Projects. (a) *Implementation of New Audit Recommendations.* Within 1 year of the date of this order, agencies shall identify, based on preliminary recommendations from the prioritization surveys required under section 302 of this order, high priority facilities to audit and shall complete the first 10 percent of the required comprehensive facility audits. Within 180 days of the completion of the comprehensive facility audit of each facility, agencies shall begin implementing cost-effective recommendations for installation of energy efficiency, water conservation, and renewable energy technologies for that facility.

(b) *Implementation of Existing Audits.* Within 180 days of the date of this order, agencies shall begin to implement cost-effective recommendations from comprehensive audits of facilities performed within the past 3 years, for installation of energy efficiency, water conservation, and renewable energy technologies.

Sec. 304. Solar and Other Renewable Energy. The goal of the Federal Government

is to significantly increase the use of solar and other renewable energy sources. DOE shall develop a program for achieving this goal cost-effectively and, within 210 days of the date of this order, submit the program to the 656 Committee for review. DOE shall lead the effort to assist agencies in meeting this goal.

Sec. 305. Minimization of Petroleum-Based Fuel Use in Federal Buildings and Facilities. All agencies shall develop and implement programs to reduce the use of petroleum in their buildings and facilities by switching to a less-polluting and nonpetroleum-based energy source, such as natural gas or solar and other renewable energy sources. Where alternative fuels are not practical or cost-effective, agencies shall strive to improve the efficiency with which they use the petroleum. Each agency shall survey its buildings and facilities that utilize petroleum-based fuel systems to determine where the potential for a dual-fuel capability exists and shall provide dual-fuel capability where cost-effective and practicable.

Sec. 306. New Space. (a) *New Federal Facility Construction.* Each agency involved in the construction of a new facility that is to be either owned by or leased to the Federal Government shall:

(1) design and construct such facility to minimize the life cycle cost of the facility by utilizing energy efficiency, water conservation, or solar or other renewable energy technologies;

(2) ensure that the design and construction of facilities meet or exceed the energy performance standards applicable to Federal residential or commercial buildings as set forth in 10 CFR 435, local building standards, or a Btu-per-gross-square-foot ceiling as determined by the Task Force within 120 days of the date of this order, whichever will result in a lower life cycle cost over the life of the facility;

(3) establish and implement, within 270 days of the date of this order, a facility commissioning program that will ensure that the construction of such facilities meets the requirements outlined in this section before the facility is accepted into the Federal facility inventory; and

(4) utilize passive solar design and adopt active solar technologies where they are cost-effective.

(b) *New Leases For Existing Facilities.* To the extent practicable and permitted by law, agencies entering into leases, including the renegotiation or extension of existing leases, shall identify the energy and water consumption of those facilities and seek to incorporate provisions into each lease that minimize the cost of energy and water under a life cycle analysis, while maintaining or improving occupant health and safety. These requirements may include renovation of proposed space prior to or within the first year of each lease. Responsible agencies shall seek to negotiate the cost of the lease, taking into account the reduced energy and water costs during the term of the lease.

(c) *Government-Owned Contractor-Operated Facilities.* All Government-owned contractor-operated facilities shall comply with the goals and requirements of this order. Energy and water management goals shall be incorporated into their management contracts.

Sec. 307. Showcase Facilities. (a) *New Building Showcases.* When an agency constructs at least five buildings in a year, it shall designate at least one building, at the earliest stage of development, to be a showcase highlighting advanced technologies and practices for energy efficiency, water conservation, or use of solar and other renewable energy.

(b) *Demonstrations in Existing Facilities.* Each agency shall designate one of its major buildings to become a showcase to highlight energy or water efficiency and also shall attempt to incorporate cogeneration, solar and other renewable energy technologies, and indoor air quality improvements. Selection of such buildings shall be based on considerations such as the level of nonfederal visitors, historic significance, and the likelihood that visitors will learn from displays and implement similar projects. Within 180 days of the date of this order, each agency shall develop and implement plans and work in cooperation with DOE and, where appropriate, in consultation with the General Services Administration ("GSA"), the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), and other appropriate agencies, to determine the most ef-

fective and cost-effective strategies to implement these demonstrations.

Sec. 308. Annual Reporting Requirements. (a) As required under the Act, the head of each agency shall report annually to the Secretary of Energy and OMB, in a format specified by the Secretary and OMB after consulting with the 656 Committee. The report shall describe the agency's progress in achieving the goals of this order.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall report to the President and the Congress annually on the implementation of this order. The report should provide information on energy and water use and cost data and shall provide the greatest level of detail practicable for buildings and facilities by energy source.

Sec. 309. Report on Full Fuel Cycle Analysis. DOE shall prepare a report on the issues involved in instituting life cycle analysis for Federal energy and product purchases that address the full fuel cycle costs, including issues concerning energy exploration, development, processing, transportation, storage, distribution, consumption, and disposal, and related impacts on the environment. The report shall examine methods for conducting life cycle analysis and implementing such analysis in the Federal sector and shall make appropriate recommendations. The report shall be forwarded to the President for review.

Sec. 310. Agency Accountability. One year after the date of this order, and every 2 years thereafter, the President's Management Council shall report to the President about efforts and actions by agencies to meet the requirements of this order. In addition, each agency head shall designate a senior official, at the Assistant Secretary level or above, to be responsible for achieving the requirements of this order and shall appoint such official to the 656 Committee. The 656 Committee shall also work to ensure the implementation of this order. The agency senior official and the 656 Committee shall coordinate implementation with the Federal Environmental Executive and Agency Environmental Executives established under Executive Order No. 12873.

Part 4—Use of Innovative Financing and Contractual Mechanisms

Sec. 401. Financing Mechanisms. In addition to available appropriations, agencies shall utilize innovative financing and contractual mechanisms, including, but not limited to, utility demand side management programs, shared energy savings contracts, and energy savings performance contracts, to meet the goals and requirements of the Act and this order.

Sec. 402. Workshop for Agencies. Within a reasonable time of the date of this order, the Director of OMB, or his or her designee, and the Task Force shall host a workshop for agencies regarding financing and contracting for energy efficiency, water efficiency, and renewable technology projects. Based on the results of that meeting, the Administrator, Office of Procurement Policy ("OFPP"), shall assist the Administrator of General Services and the Secretary of Energy in eliminating unnecessary regulatory and procedural barriers that slow the utilization of such audit, financing, and contractual mechanisms or complicate their use. All actions that are cost-effective shall be implemented through the process required in section 403 of this order.

Sec. 403. Elimination of Barriers. Agency heads shall work with their procurement officials to identify and eliminate internal regulations, procedures, or other barriers to implementation of the Act and this order. DOE shall develop a model set of recommendations that will be forwarded to the Administrator of OFPP in order to assist agencies in eliminating the identified barriers.

Part 5—Technical Assistance, Incentives, and Awareness

Sec. 501. Technical Assistance. (a) To assist Federal energy managers in implementing energy efficiency and water conservation projects, DOE shall, within 180 days of the date of this order, develop and make available through the Task Force:

(1) guidance explaining the relationship between water use and energy consumption and the energy savings achieved through water conservation measures;

(2) a model solicitation and implementation guide for innovative funding mechanisms referenced in section 401 of this order;

(3) a national list of companies providing water services in addition to the list of quali-

fied energy service companies as required by the Act;

(4) the capabilities and technologies available through the national energy laboratories; and

(5) an annually-updated guidance manual for Federal energy managers that includes, at a minimum, new sample contracts or contract provisions, position descriptions, case studies, recent guidance, and success stories.

(b) The Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Administrator of General Services, shall make available through the Task Force, within 180 days of the date of this order:

(1) the national list of qualified water and energy efficiency contractors for inclusion on a Federal schedule; and

(2) a model provision on energy efficiency and water conservation, for inclusion in new leasing contracts.

(c) Within 180 days of the date of this order, the Administrator of General Services shall:

(1) contact each utility that has an area-wide contract with GSA to determine which of those utilities will perform "no-cost" audits for energy efficiency and water conservation and potential solar and other renewable energy sources that comply with Federal life cycle costing procedures set forth in Subpart A, 10 CFR 436;

(2) for each energy and water utility serving the Federal Government, determine which of those utilities offers demand-side management services and incentives and obtain a list and description of those services and incentives; and

(3) prepare a list of those utilities and make that list available to all Federal property management agencies through the Task Force.

(d) Within 18 months of the date of this order, the Administrator of General Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop procurement techniques, methods, and contracts to speed the purchase and installation of energy, water, and renewable energy technologies in Federal facilities. Such techniques, methods, and contracts shall be designed to utilize both direct funding by the user agency, including energy savings performance contracting, and utility rebates. To the extent permitted by law, the

Administrator of OFPP shall assist the Administrator of General Services and the Secretary of Energy by eliminating unnecessary regulatory and procedural barriers that would slow the implementation of such methods, techniques, or contracts or complicate their use.

(e) Agencies are encouraged to seek technical assistance from DOE to develop and implement solar and other renewable energy projects.

(f) DOE shall conduct appropriate training for Federal agencies to assist them in identifying and funding cost-effective projects. This training shall include providing software and other technical tools to audit facilities and identify opportunities. To the extent that resources are available, DOE shall work with utilities and the private sector to encourage their participation in Federal sector programs.

(g) DOE, in coordination with EPA, GSA, and the Department of Defense ("DOD"), shall develop technical assistance services for agencies to help identify energy efficiency, water conservation, indoor air quality, solar and other renewable energy projects, new building design, fuel switching, and life cycle cost analysis. These services shall include, at a minimum, a help line, computer bulletin board, information and education materials, and project tracking methods. Agencies shall identify technical assistance needed to meet the goals and requirements of the Act and this order and seek such assistance from DOE.

(h) The Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of General Services shall explore ways to stimulate energy efficiency, water conservation, and use of solar and other renewable energy sources and shall study options such as new building performance guidelines, life cycle value engineering, and designer/builder incentives such as award fees. The studies shall be completed within 270 days of the date of this order. The OFPP will issue guidance to agencies on life cycle value engineering within 6 months of the completion of the studies.

(i) The Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of General Services shall develop and distribute through the Task Force a

model building commissioning program within 270 days of the date of this order.

(j) The lists, guidelines, and services in this section of the order shall be updated periodically.

Sec. 502. Retention of Savings and Rebates. (a) Within a reasonable time after the date of this order, the Director of OMB, along with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, to the extent practicable and permitted by law, shall develop guidelines and implement procedures to allow agencies, in fiscal year 1995 and beyond, to retain utility rebates and incentives received by the agency and savings from energy efficiency and water conservation efforts as provided in section 152 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and 10 U.S.C. 2865 and 2866.

Sec. 503. Performance Evaluations. To recognize the responsibilities of facility managers, designers, energy managers, their superiors, and, to the extent practicable and appropriate, others critical to the implementation of this order, heads of agencies shall include successful implementation of energy efficiency, water conservation, and solar and other renewable energy projects in their position descriptions and performance evaluations.

Sec. 504. Incentive Awards. Agencies are encouraged to review employee incentive programs to ensure that such programs appropriately reward exceptional performance in implementing the Act and this order. Such awards may include monetary incentives such as Quality Step Increases, leave time awards and productivity gainsharing, and nonmonetary and honor awards such as increased authority, additional resources, and a series of options from which employees or teams of employees can choose.

Sec. 505. Project Teams/Franchising. (a) Agencies are encouraged to establish Energy Efficiency and Environmental Project Teams ("Project Teams") to implement energy efficiency, water conservation, and solar and other renewable energy projects within their respective agencies. DOE shall develop a program to train and support the Project Teams, which should have particular expertise in innovative financing, including shared energy savings and energy savings perform-

ance contracting. The purpose of the program is to enable project teams to implement projects quickly and effectively in their own agencies.

(b) Agencies are encouraged to franchise the services of their Project Teams. The ability to access the services of other agencies' teams will foster excellence in project implementation through competition among service providers, while providing an alternative method to meet or exceed the requirements of the Act and this order for agencies that are unable to devote sufficient personnel to implement projects.

Sec. 506. FEMP Account Managers. FEMP shall develop a customer service program and assign account managers to agencies or regions so that each project may have a designated account manager. When requested by an agency, the account manager shall start at the audit phase and follow a project through commissioning, evaluation, and reporting. The account manager shall provide technical assistance and shall have responsibility to see that all actions possible are taken to ensure success of the project.

Sec. 507. Procurement of Energy Efficient Products by Federal Agencies. (a) "Best Practice" Technologies. Agencies shall purchase energy-efficient products in accordance with the guidelines issued by OMB, in consultation with the Defense Logistics Agency ("DLA"), DOE, and GSA, under section 161 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. The guidelines shall include listings of energy-efficient products and practices used in the Federal Government. At a minimum, OMB shall update the listings annually. DLA, DOE, and GSA shall update the portions of the listings for which they have responsibility as new products become available and conditions change.

(1) Each agency shall purchase products listed as energy-efficient in the guidelines whenever practicable, and whenever they meet the agency's specific performance requirements and are cost-effective. Each agency shall institute mechanisms to set targets and measure progress.

(2) To further encourage a market for highly-energy-efficient products, each agency shall increase, to the extent practicable and cost-effective, purchases of products that

are in the upper 25 percent of energy efficiency for all similar products, or products that are at least 10 percent more efficient than the minimum level that meets Federal standards. This requirement shall apply wherever such information is available, either through Federal or industry-approved testing and rating procedures.

(3) GSA and DLA, in consultation with DOE, other agencies, States, and industry and other nongovernment organizations, shall provide all agencies with information on specific products that meet the energy-efficiency criteria of this section. Product information should be made available in both printed and electronic formats.

(b) *Federal Market Opportunities.* DOE, after consultation with industry, utilities, and other interested parties, shall identify advanced energy-efficient and water-conserving technologies that are technically and commercially feasible but not yet available on the open market. These technologies may include, but are not limited to, the advanced appliance technologies referenced in section 127 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992. DOE, in cooperation with OMB, GSA, DOD, the National Institute of Standards and Technology ("NIST"), and EPA, shall issue a "Federal Procurement Challenge" inviting each Federal agency to commit a specified fraction of their purchases within a given time period to advanced, high-efficiency models of products, provided that these anticipated future products can meet the agency's energy performance, functionality, and cost requirements.

(c) *Accelerated Retirement of Inefficient Equipment.* DOE, in consultation with GSA and other agencies, shall establish guidelines for the cost-effective early retirement of older, inefficient appliances and other energy and water-using equipment in Federal facilities. Such guidelines may take into account significant improvements in energy efficiency and water conservation, opportunities to down-size or otherwise optimize the replacement equipment as a result of associated improvements in building envelope, system, or industrial process efficiency and reductions in pollutant emissions, use of chlorofluorocarbons, and other environmental improvements.

(d) *Review of Barriers.* Each agency shall review and revise Federal or military specifications, product descriptions, and standards to eliminate barriers to, and encourage Federal procurement of, products that are energy-efficient or water conserving.

Part 6—Waivers

Sec. 601. Waivers. Each agency may determine whether certain requirements in this order are inconsistent with the mission of the agency and seek a waiver of the provision from the Secretary of Energy. Any waivers authorized by the Secretary of Energy shall be included in the annual report on Federal energy management required under the Act.

Part 7—Revocation, Limitation, and Implementation

Sec. 701. Executive Order No. 12759, of April 17, 1991, is hereby revoked, except that sections 3, 9, and 10 of that order shall remain effective and shall not be revoked.

Sec. 702. This order is intended only to improve the internal management of the executive branch and is not intended to, and does not create, any right to administrative or judicial review, or any other right or benefit or trust responsibility, substantive or procedural, enforceable by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 703. This order shall be effective immediately.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 8, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:02 a.m., March 9, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on March 10.

Statement on the Executive Order on Energy Efficiency and Water Conservation at Federal Facilities *March 8, 1994*

For too long, we have paid too much to heat, cool, and light Federal buildings. That's why I'm directing all agencies across the Nation to make profitable investments in energy efficiency, investments that will benefit the

environment and the taxpayer. This initiative makes Government work better and cost less.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House press release announcing the signing of Executive Order 12902.

Nomination for the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

March 8, 1994

The President today announced his intent to nominate Alan Sagner to the Board of Directors for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

"Alan Sagner is a motivated individual whose talents and creativity will be a great asset to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting," the President said. "I look forward to his appointment."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks on the Earned-Income Tax Credit and an Exchange With Reporters

March 9, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, other members of the administration.

The earned-income tax credit is an important symbol of the core commitment of this administration to promote the values of work and family and community and to help people who work hard and play by the rules. It's been the driving force of everything we have tried to do since we took office, from bringing the deficit down to working to help create over 2 million jobs, health care reform to welfare reform, all the other things we are doing.

This earned-income tax credit can help to improve the lives of working people all across the country by lifting them above the poverty line. You all know that millions and millions of working people now have had stagnant wages for virtually two decades, that more and more people work hard and their wages don't keep up with inflation. The principle behind what we are doing with the earned-

income tax credit is simple: If you work for a living, you shouldn't be in poverty.

This year across our Nation, 14 million Americans will claim the credit when they file their 1993 tax returns. So we know that will help a lot of people in need. But we think there are some more things we can do. The vast majority of the millions of Americans who qualify receive their money in a lump-sum payment, like a refund, after they file their taxes. But many of them, if they have at least one child at home, could be receiving the benefit for the current year right now in their regular paychecks. By simply filling out a form with only four yes-or-no questions, the W-5 form, qualifying workers could be collecting as much as 60 percent of this benefit due them in this way spread throughout the year. That means extra money when they need it to pay for groceries or clothing or just to make ends meet between paydays.

We want qualifying Americans to know about this option. In the coming weeks we'll be getting the word out to employers everywhere, but today we're starting here in our own backyard. In the Federal Government, believe it or not, hundreds of thousands of workers are eligible for the earned-income tax credit. We want eligible Government workers to be an example of how this program can be used.

So today I am sending a memorandum to all Cabinet Secretaries and agency heads, instructing them to get that word out, to get their personnel and payroll offices on board so that Government employees know about the advance payment option for this earned-income tax credit.

It's our responsibility to help the people who need it and who have earned it. This is not a handout. It's a helping hand. That's an important distinction. It gives some breathing room to people who, day-in and day-out, have done everything they could to take care of their families, to make their own way, to be self-supporting taxpayers.

I've met with many families already who've benefited from this credit, and for some, it's helped with the most basic needs, food, clothing, shelter. For others, it's helped to bridge the way from being a semiskilled job holder to a better life with a better training

program and a better income. For still others, it's just an incentive to keep going. This program works.

Let me say that this year, because of our economic program which passed, as you know, last year, beginning in 1994 we will increase the number of people eligible for the earned-income tax credit from 14 million people to almost 20 million people. And in addition to that, the size of the benefit will begin going up rather dramatically, phased in from this year to all future years.

But what this means as a practical—for the next 4 or 5 years, when it goes up, what this means as a practical matter is that a person with a marginal income, working hard, eligible for 60 percent of this benefit every month might literally get another \$100 a month to help feed children or clothe them or meet basic family expenses. It is a very important distinction. And I want to emphasize that on the terms of getting the benefit every month, those people will qualify for the increased benefits, and there will be more people qualifying this year because that applies to 1994. So it's very, very important.

I'm going to sign this Executive order and then ask Secretary Bentsen and our IRS Commissioner, Peggy Richardson, to talk about what they're going to do.

[At this point, the President signed the memorandum. Secretary Bentsen and IRS Commissioner Richardson then made statements.]

The President. Let me just say one other thing to kind of reiterate this. To give you some idea about the numbers of people we're talking about in America, starting this year, about 83 percent of the American people will pay the same income tax rates they've been paying, adjusted for inflation; about 1.2 percent will pay a higher rate; and about 16.6 percent of total taxpayers in the country are eligible for a tax reduction. Those with children are eligible to get the monthly benefits as well as the lump-sum payment at the end of the year. This is basically an income tax cut in the form of a credit. So it's a very significant thing, one in six American taxpayers eligible for this benefit.

President's Income Tax

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what—

The President. What? What did you say?

Q. Have you paid your taxes yet?

The President. No, I haven't filled out my returns yet, I don't think. I hadn't signed my return yet. I always get—

Q. It's not April 15th.

The President. Not time yet. They'll be filed in a timely fashion. And you'll see them, as you always do.

Richard Nixon's Visit to Russia

Q. Mr. President, can you tell us what you think of Boris Yeltsin refusing to see Richard Nixon? Did you tell Richard Nixon it was okay with you if he met with former Vice President Ruskoy and the other opposition leaders?

The President. I did, yes. He told me he wanted to do that because, as a non-Government official, he felt that it was an appropriate thing for him to do, basically going to Russia on a fact-finding mission to listen to people who had views very different from not only the Russian Government, from his own and from my own. And he said he thought he was in a different position from me, for example, and I agreed that he was in a different position. So he said that's what he intended to do. And I told him that was—I would be interested in hearing his report when he got back.

Q. What do you make of Boris Yeltsin refusing to see Richard Nixon as a result?

The President. Well, of course, you have to—it's up to President Yeltsin whom he sees and doesn't see. I wish he would see him because I think they'd enjoy talking to one another. And I think Richard Nixon is basically quite sympathetic with the dilemmas faced by Boris Yeltsin and generally quite supportive of his administration. So I would hope that he will see him, but I don't think it's, you know, it's not the end of the world.

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, how do you feel about the pullout, now, of all the troops from Somalia?

The President. Well, first, I want to compliment our military people; they are doing an excellent job. They've handled it very well. And I think, as I have said all along, you know, this was originally—if you go back to

1992, this whole mission was billed as a humanitarian mission. And the first time President Bush spoke with me about it, he said he thought maybe they would be out before I was inaugurated or by the end of January. And what we learned from that, of course, is that at least in the case of Somalia and many other cases, you can't have a humanitarian mission divorced from the political problems of the time. The people in Somalia were starving not because there was no food that could be given to them, they were starving because of the political and military conflicts consuming the country.

The United States, and then the United Nations, went in there to give the people of Somalia a chance not only to save lives, restore normalcy, end starvation but to give them a chance to work out their own problems in a different way. And I think we have given them that chance. The American people have been very generous with their money and with their support. We have lost some of our most precious resources, our young people, in Somalia because of the nature of the conflict. And I think we have done our job there and then some. And I feel very—

Q. But the civil war will resume there.

The President. Well, we don't know that. I mean, they still—that's up to them. But there's civil wars in a lot of countries in this world that we have not made anything like the effort for we've made in Somalia. There's a civil war in Sudan; there's a civil war in Angola; there were lots of people killed in Burundi. I mean, that's just in Africa, never mind all these other places.

So we have made an extraordinary effort, the United States has, to help the people of Somalia. And the leaders there now have a choice to make. There are still United Nations forces there. They're still in a position to guarantee the availability of food and medicine and a more humane life. And they will have to decide whether they care more about that and care more about their people and seeing their children healthy, or whether they want to let the country be consumed in war again. But they have to take some responsibility now. The responsibility is shifting back to the leaders there on the ground. And they ought to work it out. They ought to pre-

fer the life their people have had the last 14 months or so, 15 months, to what they had before. But it's up to them.

Richard Nixon's Visit to Russia

Q. Mr. President, back on Russia, can you tell us about your conversation with Mr. Yeltsin? He seemed to suggest that you agreed with him on the Nixon visit. Did you talk with him about this?

The President. Mr. Yeltsin?

Q. Did you talk with him or with anyone?

The President. I don't believe—I don't think Boris Yeltsin and I discussed President Nixon's visit. I don't believe we did. You know, I talk to him on a fairly regular basis, but I think the last time we talked we were talking about Bosnia, and I don't think we had a conversation about it.

But I did talk with Richard Nixon, President Nixon, before he went there. And he raised this prospect of meeting with some of the opposition leaders. He said he thought it would be interesting. He wanted to get a feel for where they were and what kind of people they were. And again, he said he was not in the Government of the United States; he was in a different position. And I said I had no—he should meet with whom-ever he wanted and I'd be interested to hear his reports when he got back.

Q. But you don't think it's a diplomatic insult for Richard Nixon to have seen these other leaders, opposition leaders?

The President. No, because he's not in the Government. You know, he's not even—he was over there on a fact-finding mission, and as I said, Richard Nixon has been extremely supportive of this administration's Russia policy, which has been extremely supportive of President Yeltsin and his objectives. So I think he's been, in that sense, as an American citizen and a longtime expert on that area of the world, he's been very supportive of the objectives of President Yeltsin, and I think it should be seen in that light.

Again, I can't speak to whatever the dynamics are in Russian domestic politics at this time and whether that is having any impact on President Yeltsin's decision. I can't speak to that. But all I'm saying is that I think that President Yeltsin should not assume that Richard Nixon is not friendly toward his ad-

ministration and toward democracy and toward reform, because quite the contrary, he's been a very strong supporter of our policy for the last year. And I wouldn't overreact to the fact that he met with some people who are in opposition to President Yeltsin.

Thank you.

Whitewater Investigation

Q. Mr. President, what advice do you have for top aides who are appearing in Federal court about Whitewater and——

The President. Just the same advice I give everybody, you know, just tell them what happened, answer the questions, and go on. Be very open.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:50 a.m. in the Oval Office at the White House.

Memorandum on the Earned-Income Tax Credit

March 9, 1994

Memorandum for All Cabinet Secretaries and Agency Heads

Subject: Earned Income Tax Credit Directive

Last year, we fought for, and won, a major expansion of the earned income tax credit (EITC) through enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. This credit will help millions of workers and is a cornerstone of our effort to reform the welfare system and make work pay.

We must ensure that all workers in America who are eligible to receive the EITC are made aware of the program and of the advance payment option. It has been estimated that approximately 2 million of those eligible for the EITC miss the opportunity to claim it because they do not even realize that the EITC is available to them. Furthermore, less than 1 percent of those who claimed EITC in past years took advantage of the advanced payment option, which would allow some participants to obtain up to 60 percent of their credit in their paychecks rather than waiting until the filing of their tax return to receive it.

In our own departments and agencies, we must begin to spread the word about the

EITC and help eligible workers meet the day-to-day expenses of raising a family by claiming the advanced EITC. There are hundreds of thousands of workers within the executive branch alone who are potentially eligible for the EITC. Many personnel and payroll offices within your bureaus and agencies are not aware of the credit, and have not informed Federal employees about the possibility of obtaining the credit in their paychecks under the advance payment option.

You are directed to instruct all bureau heads, personnel, and payroll office managers in your purview to take measures, in cooperation with the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Office of Personnel Management, to ensure that all potentially eligible employees are informed about the EITC and can claim it on an advance basis through their paychecks.

I also strongly encourage you and your bureau heads to join me over the next several weeks in incorporating these important EITC messages into speeches and presentations that you may be making before the public. Your efforts in your organization will complement an Administration campaign to promote the EITC with business leaders, members of Congress, State and local government leaders, and EITC eligibles. Through these actions, we hope to markedly improve the effectiveness of an already successful EITC program, rewarding work, and laying a foundation to end welfare as we know it.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks on the "Reemployment Act of 1994"

March 9, 1994

Thank you very much, John, for that introduction. Mr. Vice President, Secretary Reich, thank you for your wonderful work on this project. Lane Kirkland and Larry Perlman, thank you for being up here with us and for representing the American business and

labor communities in the partnership we hope to build.

And I want to thank John Hahn from Niagara County, New York. I met him last month. As he said, he was laid off after 28 years at Bell Aerospace, and he learned new skills after 28 years as a biomedical technician. He and Deb Woodbury and Donald Hutchinson were all on our panel. It was a good one, and I learned a lot listening to them.

This morning when we were going over the day, early morning in the White House, Mack McLarty mentioned to me, he said, "We're going to talk about two things today that you ran for President to do something about because it helps all the people we grew up with." When I started out on the long quest which led all of us to this particular moment, and I talked to a lot of my fellow Governors and friends who are mayors, and others, it seemed to me that this country was really at some risk of being thrown into the 21st century not being able to preserve the American dream and keep going and that there were at least three huge problems for ordinary Americans.

One was that more and more Americans were working harder and harder for stagnant wages and falling closer and closer to the poverty line. That's why we announced today the initiative on the earned-income tax credit and how it was going to impact working families with children to lift them out of poverty.

Another was that no matter how low unemployment gets in some areas, so many Americans are left behind by education and location, normally. But it means that when we have a 6.5 percent unemployment rate, as we do today, it's in fact quite a misnomer; that the unemployment rate today among people with a college degree is 3.5 percent; and among people with some education after high school, at least 2 years of further training, is a little over 5 percent; and among high school graduates a little over 7 percent; and among high school dropouts about 12 percent; and in many inner cities it's 20 percent; and among minority youths in many inner cities it's over 50 percent. So the number doesn't mean anything if there are huge pockets where no investment is made in people. And the Vice President and Henry Cisneros and Secretary of Education who is

here, the Secretary of Labor and others are working on this whole community empowerment initiative to try to focus on that.

The third big problem is the one we come here to address today, the problem represented by these three fine people. And that is that the average American will change jobs seven or eight times in a lifetime whether he/she likes it or not. And what we have to do is to make sure that they can like it, that these changes will add to people's security, not to their insecurity. And we know that unless we do that, that all of our bigger policies will not have a big impact on the ordinary lives of the people that sent us all here in the first place.

I'm proud of the fact that the efforts that we've made to bring the deficit down and get interest rates down have led to big increases in investment and over 2 million new jobs in the last year. But there are lots of people who can't access those jobs. And as the Secretary of Labor said, there's still a huge amount of turnover in this economy. That's why this "Reemployment Act of 1994" is so important.

I think every one of you who has ever dealt with it knows that the existing system for unemployment and training is simply broken in the sense that it was designed for an economy that no longer exists. It was designed basically just to hold people tight with a wage that was below their earning but enough to live on until their old jobs came back, because most jobs were lost in ordinary cyclical recessions. But now we know that the great majority of workers who are laid off aren't going to get their old jobs back, that they're either caused by structural changes in the economy or changes in the nature of those particular job requirements themselves.

Last year, three out of four laid-off workers expected to lose their jobs permanently, the highest figure since the Labor Department began keeping these statistics. The existing training system, as the Members of Congress know, is a crazy quilt of separate programs that too often puts bureaucracy first and leaves the customers, the unemployed workers, bewildered.

This act is designed to fix the system that's broken, outmoded, bureaucratic, and too

often delays people getting back to work instead of accelerating their return to the work force. It will build a new system to help workers get the training and counseling they need to fill higher wage jobs more quickly.

The plan has four points: first, to replace all these fragmented programs with one-stop shopping; second, to offer more choices for reemployment services that will put people back to work. We do have, to be fair to America and to give our country and our private sector a pat on the back, the most mobile and flexible labor markets of any of the advanced countries. But oftentimes these retraining and unemployment programs actually put barriers in that mobility instead of speeding it up. Third, we want to put the private sector, business, and labor in charge of making sure that this training actually prepares people for real jobs—that if we are going to spend money on training programs, that the money will be well spent and relevantly spent. And fourth, we want real accountability in the system so that we invest in job training programs that actually lead to jobs.

Right now there are six separate programs for dislocated workers. And workers get bounced around from office to office, program to program. We have examples of workers in the same work force facing the same dislocation, one eligible for one program, another eligible for another, with the benefits and the coverages different. So the first element of the plan is to create one-stop shopping so workers can go to one office and get the counseling and assistance they need and learn about new job opportunities, the skills those jobs require, and the best training programs to teach those particular skills at one place. No American unemployed person should have to navigate the maze of laws that the Congress passes for different reasons. The average American doesn't care what law he or she fits under. They just want to know: Here I am; I need a job; I need training; how am I going to get it?

The second part of the plan is to make sure that along with this one-stop shopping, workers will have the widest possible range of choices for training and employment, letting the marketplace bring to bear the kinds of things that we know are there today. We

want to first reach out to workers as soon as possible after they lose their jobs, or whenever possible, as we found in Sunnyvale, California, which the Vice President mentioned, get advanced notice of that. And then we want to offer them an array of choices that will help them to find the opportunities and the training they need from a computer-based network with information on job openings throughout the country to counseling on job searches, on-the-job training, long-term training for new skills, and training for people who want to start their own businesses.

For workers who start those new businesses, our plan will allow them to make a start while still drawing unemployment insurance. And for every worker, we offer the opportunity to make his or her own choices about employment and training, not to have someone else make those choices for them.

We want to also train people for real jobs. That's why the third part of the plan is to make sure that the efforts are guided by people who have real experience in those jobs, American business and labor folks. Local work force investment boards, appointed by local elected officials, will oversee these one-stop centers. Business representatives from CEO's to plant managers will form the majority. There will be representatives from labor and from the schools. And because business and labor are already doing so much to train workers, we want to encourage companies and unions to establish their own one-stop centers for their own workers hit by layoffs and plant closings.

Finally, this approach will demand accountability. We cannot afford to waste the taxpayers' time or money or, more importantly, the workers' time and the benefits that run by all too quickly, on fly-by-night proprietary schools or Government programs long on redtape and short on results. We have to empower laid-off workers to choose their training from among private and public providers who will compete for their business, require that the providers offer them consumer reports so they'll be able to make informed choices: how many people got what kind of jobs at what kind of pay? That, after all, is the ultimate test.

And the Secretary of Labor, under this approach, must define measurable perform-

ance standards for training programs, and those that fall short of the standards should lose their right to the money. In 5 days, the leaders of the world's industrial nations will meet in Detroit to discuss how to create high-wage jobs for all our people. Our country's great strength is our resilience and adaptability. That's what helps our businesses and our workers to be as dynamic as this economy.

We know that other countries marvel still at the amount of flexibility in our work force and in our economy. And the amount of increased productivity we saw in the last quarter—just today, the report that we had the highest increase in productivity in the last 3 months of last year that we had in 8 years. But we know that that still is not benefiting too many Americans who are lost in the gaps of change.

The "Reemployment Act of 1994" builds on our greatest strengths, invests in our most important resource—our people—so that we can turn the 20th century safety net into a 21st century springboard to succeed and win in the global economy.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:26 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Lane Kirkland, president, AFL-CIO; Larry Perlman, chief executive officer, Ceridan Corp.; and John Hahn, Deb Woodbury, and Donald Hutchinson, participants in the February 2, Department of Labor conference on re-employment.

Message on the Observance of Id al-Fitr

March 9, 1994

My family and I wish to extend our personal greetings to all in the Muslim Community celebrating the Id al-Fitr.

This week marks the end of the holy month of Ramadan for Muslims in the United States and around the world. A time for rejoicing and celebrating, this Id in particular also reminds us of our shared responsibility to work for a better future for all the world's people—especially in the wake of the Hebron massacre. Let us all rededicate our-

selves to realizing this goal in the Middle East and around the world.

In the United States, this is an occasion for us to reflect with pride on the achievements of Muslim Americans and to take satisfaction in the historic and constructive relations which we have had with Muslim countries around the world. Central tenets of the Ramadan fast that is now ending are responsibility for those less fortunate and rededication—individual by individual—to the creation of a better community and a better world. These are ideals that stand as beacons for people of all faiths everywhere.

On this occasion, let me convey to you my very best wishes with the traditional greeting: May peace be with you and may God grant you health and prosperity now and in the years ahead.

NOTE: An original was not available for verification of the content of this message.

Executive Order 12903—Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM

March 9, 1994

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including section 126a(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2155(a)(2)), and having determined that, upon the expiration of the period specified in the first proviso to section 126a(2) of such Act and extended for 12-month periods by Executive Orders Nos. 12193, 12295, 12351, 12409, 12463, 12506, 12554, 12587, 12629, 12670, 12706, 12753, 12791, and 12840, failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with the European Atomic Energy Community would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of United States non-proliferation objectives and would otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States, and having notified the Congress of this determination, I hereby extend the duration of that period to March 10, 1995. Executive

Order No. 12840 shall be superseded on the effective date of this Executive order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 9, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register,
3:57 p.m., March 9, 1994]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the
Federal Register on March 11.

Message to the Congress on Nuclear Cooperation With EURATOM

March 9, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States has been engaged in nuclear cooperation with the European Community (now European Union) for many years. This cooperation was initiated under agreements that were concluded over three decades ago between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and that extend until December 31, 1995. Since the inception of this cooperation, EURATOM has adhered to all its obligations under those agreements.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish new nuclear export criteria, including a requirement that the United States have a right to consent to the reprocessing of fuel exported from the United States. Our present agreements for cooperation with EURATOM do not contain such a right. To avoid disrupting cooperation with EURATOM, a proviso was included in the law to enable continued cooperation until March 10, 1980, if EURATOM agreed to negotiations concerning our cooperation agreements. EURATOM agreed in 1978 to such negotiations.

The law also provides that nuclear cooperation with EURATOM can be extended on an annual basis after March 10, 1980, upon determination by the President that failure to cooperate would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives or otherwise jeopardize the common defense and security, and after notification to the Congress. President

Carter made such a determination 14 years ago and signed Executive Order No. 12193, permitting nuclear cooperation with EURATOM to continue until March 10, 1981. President Reagan made such determinations in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, and 1988, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12295, 12351, 12409, 12463, 12506, 12554, 12587, and 12629 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1989. President Bush made such determinations in 1989, 1990, 1991, and 1992, and signed Executive Orders Nos. 12670, 12706, 12753, and 12791 permitting nuclear cooperation to continue through March 10, 1993. Last year I signed Executive Order No. 12840 to extend cooperation for an additional year, until March 10, 1994.

In addition to numerous informal contacts, the United States has engaged in frequent talks with EURATOM regarding the renegotiation of the U.S.-EURATOM agreements for cooperation. Talks were conducted in November 1978, September 1979, April 1980, January 1982, November 1983, March 1984, May, September, and November 1985, April and July 1986, September 1987, September and November 1988, July and December 1989, February, April, October, and December 1990, and September 1991. Formal negotiations on a new agreement were held in April, September, and December 1992, and in March, July, and October 1993. They are expected to continue this year.

I believe that it is essential that cooperation between the United States and EURATOM continue, and likewise, that we work closely with our allies to counter the threat of proliferation of nuclear explosives. Not only would a disruption of nuclear cooperation with EURATOM eliminate any chance of progress in our talks with that organization related to our agreements, it would also cause serious problems in our overall relationships. Accordingly, I have determined that failure to continue peaceful nuclear cooperation with EURATOM would be seriously prejudicial to the achievement of U.S. non-proliferation objectives and would jeopardize the common defense and security of the United States. I therefore intend to sign an Executive order to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export cri-

terion of the Atomic Energy Act for an additional 12 months from March 10, 1994.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 9, 1994.

**Message to the Senate Transmitting
Maritime Boundary Treaties With
the United Kingdom**

March 9, 1994

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Treaty Between the United States and the United Kingdom on the Delimitation in the Caribbean of a Maritime Boundary Relating to the U.S. Virgin Islands and Anguilla and the Treaty Between the United States and United Kingdom on the Delimitation in the Caribbean of a Maritime Boundary Relating to Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands and the British Virgin Islands, with Annex. Both treaties were signed at London, November 5, 1993. I also enclose for the information of the Senate the report of the Department of State with respect to these agreements.

The treaties establish maritime boundaries between the United States and the United Kingdom relating to our respective Caribbean territories. One treaty creates a 288 nautical mile long boundary between the United States territories of Puerto Rico/U.S. Virgin Islands and the British Virgin Islands. The other treaty establishes a maritime boundary 1.34 nautical miles in length situated about 40 nautical miles from the U.S. Virgin Islands and Anguilla.

The boundaries define the limits within which each Party may exercise maritime jurisdiction. In the treaty creating a boundary with the British Virgin Islands, this includes territorial sea, fishing, and exclusive economic zone jurisdiction. The boundary with Anguilla separates fishing and exclusive economic zone jurisdiction.

I believe the treaties to be fully in the interest of the United States. They reflect the tradition of cooperation and close ties the Parties have had in this region. These boundaries have never been disputed. The boundary lines established by the treaties formalize

the practice that both Parties have followed since 1977 concerning these maritime limits. In establishing the equidistant boundaries, both sides have worked closely together in applying modern surveying techniques and precise technical calculations. The treaties will permit more effective regulating of marine resource activities and other ocean uses.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to these treaties and advice and consent to ratification.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
March 9, 1994.

**Appointment of Deputy Assistant to
the President for Speechwriting and
Research**

March 9, 1994

The President today named Donald A. Baer, assistant managing editor of U.S. News & World Report and a reporter and former lawyer, to serve as Deputy Assistant to the President for Speechwriting and Research.

"Don Baer is a writer of depth and talent who understands, both from the experience of his life and from his career as a reporter and editor, the challenges that face Americans all across the country in their daily lives," the President said. "I look forward to Don's able assistance as we work to communicate my administration's vision of hope and opportunity to the American people."

NOTE: A biography of the appointee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

**Nomination for United States
District Court Judges**

March 9, 1994

The President today nominated six individuals to serve on the U.S. District Court. They are: Richard A. Paez for the Central District of California; Clarence Cooper for the Northern District of Georgia; Denise Page Hood for the Eastern District of Michigan; Solomon Oliver, Jr. for the Northern District of Ohio; Terry C. Kern for the Northern District of Oklahoma; and B. Michael Burrage

for the Northern, Eastern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma.

"These six individuals have impressive records of achievement in both the law and public service," the President said today. "I am confident that they will serve with excellence and distinction as members of the Federal judiciary."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks at the AmeriCorps Public Safety Forum in New York City *March 10, 1994*

The President. Thank you very much, President Lattin, and my good friend Congressman Chuck Schumer. And in a moment you'll hear from Eli Segal, who is the head of our national service effort, so I won't introduce him more now. I want to thank all of the members of all the service groups who are here from not only from New York but many from other States, and recognize the chair of the board of the corporation of national service, Mr. Jim Josephs, who came. Thank you for being here, sir. I also want to thank three distinguished New Yorkers for their presence in the audience: your new attorney general Oliver Koppell; New York City's public advocate and my longtime friend, Mr. Mark Green; and the man who first introduced me to the local government of the city of Brooklyn, the Brooklyn borough president, Howard Golden. Thank you.

Before Chuck Schumer sits down, I want to ask him to come back up here to show you; this man has a broken arm, as you can see. And he's slightly incapacitated. So I asked him if I could join his two children and sign his cast. I do this to make a point I try to make at every speech, which is that government cannot solve all the problems of America. That's why we need all of you in service. And government cannot solve all these problems, either, because he is not the victim of a crime but his own awkwardness. He fell. This is a problem I can't solve, so I'm just putting my stamp of approval on the treatment of it. *[Laughter]*

Representative Charles Schumer. Mr. President, what I wanted to say is, you saw

our Senator wearing a cast, but he broke his arm the Republican way, skiing in Vail. *[Laughter]* I broke my arm slipping on the ice 11 o'clock Saturday night to go to a community event at the Good Shepherd School in Sheepshead Bay.

The President. That wasn't on the program. But it was pretty funny. *[Laughter]*

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the first of a national series of programs on our national service program which we called AmeriCorps. The topic we are here to discuss today is how to bring people together and communities together to encourage them to assume some responsibility for dealing with the violence that has become all too common in most American communities.

It's appropriate that we begin here in New York City, that we begin in Brooklyn in the congressional district of Chuck Schumer, because he has been the architect and the strategist behind almost every major anticrime initiative that the Congress dealt with in recent years.

It took 7 years and a change of administrations, but we finally got the Brady bill to become the Brady law. There were skeptics who said this will not make any difference, but you ought to see the results in the first couple of weeks of the Brady bill becoming a law. All over America, in little communities and big, people who had criminal records were actually buying guns formally, legally in gun stores; they were found out; illegal guns were collected; criminals were apprehended. This law is going to make a difference.

Chuck Schumer has also worked for community policing and for safe schools and for the ban on assault weapons that he talked about so strongly. That ban on assault weapons is in the crime bill that has already passed the United States Senate. And tomorrow Mr. Schumer goes back to Washington to work with his subcommittee to begin to mark up the crime bill that also will put another 100,000 police officers on the street, ban 28 kinds of assault weapons, and give us the chance to give people like you the chance to do some things to prevent crime from happening, and give our young people something to say yes to, as well as to say no to.

I'd also like to say a special word of appreciation for the work that has been done by New York Senator Daniel Moynihan on this issue. He asked me to say to you how sorry he was he couldn't be here today. He had originally planned to come with me but had an obligation in Washington which prevented him from leaving. But for 28 years he's been warning us about the fragile state of families and communities, the social institutions that hold us all together.

About a year ago, he gave a speech at the 50th anniversary of his own high school graduation from Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem. In that speech he talked about how much New York had changed in 50 years. In 1943, he said, there were exactly 44 homicides by gunshot in the entire city of New York, when the population then was only 150,000 more than it is now, but was more. In 1992, instead of 44, there were 1,499. He sent me a chart that tracked the murder rate in New York since the turn of the century, and it was only a generation ago that the murder rate began to explode.

About that time, on a New York night 30 years ago this very Sunday, a 28-year-old woman known to the neighborhood as Kitty Genovese parked her car outside her home, as she always did. She was coming home after a long day working as the manager of a nearby bar. She had come to New York to work, to make a life for herself in this great city, drawn like so many before and since by the power of opportunity and enthusiasm that I see in this room. As she walked to her building, a man grabbed her and stabbed her. She cried for help. She screamed for help so loudly that it woke people up in the middle of the night. Lights came on in the apartment building; a window opened; the attacker got nervous and left. Now, this was 30 years ago, not 30 days ago. But not a single person came to the aid of the woman as she tried to get herself to safety. So the man came back and stabbed her again. As 38 witnesses watched or listened from the safety of their own homes, Kitty Genovese screamed that she was dying. So the attacker fled again, but still no one came to the rescue. No one even called the police at a time when the average response time was 2 minutes. So the attacker came back a third time, stabbed Kitty Geno-

vese again and killed her, over 20 minutes after she first cried for help. A call to the police would have brought a patrol car in 2 minutes. But as one man told investigators, "I don't want to get involved."

Well, that story shocked us all 30 years ago, not just because of what happened to that woman, as tragic as it was, but also because of what had happened to her neighbors. It sent a chilling message about what had happened at that time in a society, suggesting that we were each of us not simply in danger but fundamentally alone. It was a message that was both resonant and at odds with the times. I still remember it as if it were yesterday, even though I was much younger then than almost all of you are now.

Modern technology was connecting everyone even then with the television set, a telephone, and an automobile. New highways let us reach out to each other faster than ever before. Rockets were already taking astronauts into space; even the moon was getting closer. These new inventions made the world a smaller place. We were becoming more aware of the great diversity of America, of people who lived beyond the borders of our neighborhoods or past the railroad tracks at the quiet end of town. More Americans of more race and backgrounds than ever before even then could chase the promise that lay before them. Young families left their streets or their farms in search of better jobs in the cities; factories hummed; industries then, as now again, were the envy of the world. But the unintended result of all this chasing around is that we became uprooted. The more folks moved around, the more they became strangers to their neighbors. More doors were shut; more locks were bought and turned; more curtains were drawn as they were on the night that Kitty Genovese was killed. On that night, it was as if the value of responsibility had already come to mean only responsibility for yourself.

Four years after that incident, a young United States Senator from New York, running for the office I now hold, said this, "The real threat of crime is what it does to ourselves and our communities. No nation hiding behind locked doors is free, for it is imprisoned by its own fear. A nation which surrenders to crime is a society which has re-

signed itself to failure. Thus, the fight against crime is, in the last analysis, the same as the fight for equal opportunity or the battle against hunger and deprivation or the struggle to prevent the pollution of our air and water. It is a fight to preserve the quality of community, which is at the root of our greatness, a fight to reserve confidence in ourselves and our fellow citizens, a battle for the quality of our lives."

Two months later the man who spoke those words, Senator Robert Kennedy, himself lay slain. And a line of mourners more than a mile long wrapped around St. Patrick's Cathedral, tied to his coffin in their common grief but still too far apart from one another.

Many, many times in the years since, in this city and in others, we have honored memories of the fallen. But we have failed to heed their warnings or finish their work. Time after time, we hear the lonesome sound of pipes at the funeral of a police officer killed in the line of duty. We hear the soft sobs of a mother bearing another child gunned down on another city playground or in another school. We read the tragic news of the young student shot while simply riding a van across the Brooklyn Bridge.

This very morning back in Washington, people are reading about how one student shot another student four times yesterday in an argument arising out of the fact that they bumped into each other in a school hallway in what we all thought was perhaps our safest public high school in Washington.

Too often our reaction to the violence is to simply hunker down and turn our backs, raise the drawbridge, buy a better lock, and leave the problem to others: the thin line of blue or the gray mass of government.

Justice Edwin Torres who grew up in the barrio and is now a justice of the New York supreme court, sees this problem in his courtroom every day, and he wrote a stunning letter to Senator Moynihan not too long ago in which he described people so beaten down by the daily barrage of violence that they almost apologize for being the victims—as if you were smart enough or strong enough, no matter how bad things got, you could just figure out a way not to be a victim.

No citizen of this great Nation should ever have to apologize for that. And no American

should live in fear. No one should surrender to any of this for a moment. And so I come to you to ask for your help and those like you all across America to take back our neighborhoods, to take back our future, to take back the basic quality of our lives.

Thirty years ago, if Kitty Genovese's murder taught us that we can't look away, the years since surely teach us that we cannot look to others. Thirty years ago, her life might have been saved if she had simply called—or had someone, who was looking at the whole thing unfold, called the local police. Today even that is not enough. We have to help, each and every one of us, to reclaim our streets, our schools, our communities, and our lives.

This is not a call for blind heroics but practical action if we want to save our own citizenship. I have met some heroes who deserve our praise. I met, when I came to New York a few weeks ago, the three men who subdued the gunman on the Long Island Railroad. I met in Ohio just 3 weeks ago Anne Ross from Dayton, who organized a neighborhood group to sweep drugs off their streets. They've taken down the numbers of license plates of drug dealers. They've shared photographs of dealers with the police. They've shut down crack houses and turned them over to families who don't deal drugs or use them, all the while having their lives threatened, she, her husband, and the others who she's mobilized.

Two weeks ago in Chicago, I met a woman named Carol Ridley, whose own son was shot by someone who said he was his son's best friend, when the boy was only 22, in a foolish argument. But instead of withdrawing into her own grief, she's gone outward, working in Save The Children seminars to try to stop children from killing other children, to try to end the madness of all these weapons being in the hands of people who shouldn't have them, and to try to teach young people that there are other ways in which they can deal with their anger and frustration.

These ordinary people have done extraordinary things. The first is to prove that there can be something more powerful than fear, and that is our will and our collective ability to change the way things are. We have reached a time when we have to change not

only our laws—not only the Brady bill and the crime bill and put more police on the street—we're got to change the basic attitudes of this country, not only about crime and violence but about how we think about ourselves and one another.

None of us any longer can pretend not to hear these cries for help, and each of us has a serious personal responsibility to do our part. Government cannot do this job alone; neither can the police forces themselves. But together there are things we can do, and one of the best is this new national service program, AmeriCorps.

It represents the best of our country. It will give Americans, especially the young, a chance to serve our Nation by helping their communities, helping to make our schools and streets safer, immunizing our babies and turning our children into better students, cleaning up our parks, and caring for the elderly.

Today we'll hear from Americans from all walks of life who are as different in background, age, and experiences as the AmeriCorps can possibly be. Some will have had the fabric of their lives ripped by crime. But what makes them alike, and what makes me so hopeful, is that out of their tragedies they each made a choice to make a difference.

As extraordinary as their stories are, keep this in mind: There are thousands, indeed tens of thousands, legions more like them everywhere in this country, in every community: ordinary Americans doing extraordinary things, Americans reconnecting others in their communities. That's what AmeriCorps is all about. For all the miracles of mankind's technology and discovery, nothing, still, nothing connects us to one another like an outstretched hand, an open heart, and the certainty that each of us has made a difference.

We will make a difference if we can give our people something to say yes to, introduce them to people they can look up to, give them a chance to live and learn the meaning of responsibility and opportunity and community.

When I was a young man, I read a book by a fellow southerner named James Agee, called "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men". It was the story of desperately, desperately

poor people in my region of the country, the South, during the Great Depression. It remains a book as powerful today as it was the day it was written. You cannot imagine, I don't think, what it was like to live in times when whole States had half the people living below the poverty line, when there were massive stretches of communities where more than half the people were out of work, where people could only eat because they were able to grow a little food in the ground that they held on to.

And in that time, James Agee wrote this, and I think it is something that we ought to remember as we drive up and down Flatbush Avenue in Brooklyn. Listen to this, "In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances and no matter what parents, the potentiality of the whole human race is born again. And in him, too, once more, and of each of us, our terrific responsibility toward human life, toward the utmost idea of goodness, of the horror of error, and of God."

It is not enough for any of us to ever to say again what was said here 30 years ago, "I don't want to get involved." We must not only want to get involved; we must be involved. We must be good neighbors again. And in being good neighbors, we will reclaim for ourselves the promise of this great Nation.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

[An audience member asked why the President had not publicly supported AIDS legislation introduced by Representative Jerrold Nadler.]

The President. I'll be glad to talk to Mr. Nadler about that. Every time——

Q. Have you—[inaudible].

The President. No. Nobody has ever mentioned it to me before. But let me say this——

Q. [Inaudible]—about this plan.

The President. I've listened to you. Will you listen to me? Will you listen to me? I've listened to you. It is always convenient to me, when you interrupt my meetings, how often you ignore what has been done: the first AIDS czar, the first time we have ever had a really national strategy, dramatic increases in funding in research, dramatic increases in

funding in funds to care for people with AIDS, dramatic increases in efforts to prevent AIDS from occurring. We are doing far more than has ever been done before.

I will be happy——

Q. Why haven't—[*inaudible*].

The President. Listen to me. I've listened to you. I let you interrupt this meeting, and I let you talk. And you have taken up all the time of all the people that are in here.

Q. I let you speak.

The President. No, you haven't. You're trying to interrupt me. They let me speak. They invited me here, not you. I have told you, I will be glad to discuss this—[*inaudible*—no, leave him alone. Don't hurt him. Don't hurt him. He's got a right to be here.

Q. [*Inaudible*—is in Congress—[*inaudible*—why aren't you supporting this? It is a crime.

Q. Welcome to Brooklyn. [*Laughter*]

The President. What did he say? I didn't hear.

Q. Welcome to Brooklyn.

The President. Let me ask you this: Wouldn't you rather have him in here asking me to do something than standing outside convinced I wouldn't do anything, no matter what? [*Applause*] It's a miracle.

Go on, Eli.

[*At this point, Chicago Police Chief Matt L. Rodriguez and Officer Andy Mill of the San Diego Police Department discussed community policing.*]

Mr. Segal. Mr. President, do you have any questions or comments for our guests today?

The President. Well, I wanted to say, first of all, how much I appreciate your being here and how much I appreciate hearing from police officers that there's something for the community to do with the police, and specifically, the details that you recommended.

I don't think I can overstate the importance of having a presence on the streets and in the neighborhoods and the communities, either by having volunteers do what Chief Rodriguez said and go behind the scenes so more police officers can be out there, or having senior volunteers or others walking the streets. We have a lot of evidence that this helps prevent crime in the first place. We're not talking about just catching criminals;

we're talking about recreating a sense of order, reminding people of what the rules of society are, just sort of physically being there. There's a lot of evidence that that reduces crime.

And you mentioned that I had the New York City police officer, Kevin Jett, down to the State of the Union Address, recognized him. And we brought him back to the White House afterward and had a nice talk with him. And he talked a lot about that, about how he saw a big part of his job as stopping crime in the first place by just being there and know what was going on.

The second thing I want to say is, it's easy to underestimate, I think, how much ordinary citizens can do. In Chicago, I have actually been in some of your housing projects where welfare mothers got their first jobs in the projects, patrolling the stairs, and getting discounts on their rent, among other things, in return for working, patrolling the stairs. But it all worked together to make these housing projects crime-free instead of places of fear.

So I guess I just want to thank you and to—the one thing that I would like to ask as a practical matter is how you think we can best assure that—and I'm going to lead you, but I know you want this—one of the things that always bothers me is when we—Mr. Schumer knows this—we pass a bill through Congress, the temptation is to say exactly how the money ought to be spent that we're appropriating. And it appears to me, just from the two different cases that the two of you cited, drastically different, that we ought to make community policing money available with as much flexibility as possible, because New York's idea about how to handle this may be different from San Diego's or Chicago's.

And so maybe you should comment on that. I think it's important that we send a clear signal. We don't want to tie the hands of the local officers too much.

[*Chief Rodriguez concurred with the President's statement supporting local control of resources, and Officer Mill discussed other aspects of community policing.*]

The President. I just want to reemphasize what these two guys have said. Now, here

are people who are spending their lives in law enforcement. And as Governor—I know I've had this conversation, with Governor Cuomo before, that all the bills I have signed—I was a Governor for 12 years before I became President—I have signed bill after bill after bill building more prison space, having longer sentences for serious crimes. I watched the average amount of time served by an inmate go up rather dramatically during my term as Governor. I saw the reintroduction of capital punishment after years in which we didn't have it. I understand all about this punishment business, but if you look at it, the crime rate still keeps getting worse. What lowers the crime rate is the involvement of the community and the intelligent and adequate allocation of police resources.

And I think it is very important that you understand this is not just idle rhetoric. I mean, these people have put their lives on the line for years and years and years. They know what they are talking about. We have to reclaim our streets and lower the crime rate through people like you supporting the kinds of ideas that they put out. This is not soft; this is hard. This is save yourself by rebuilding your community.

I thank you both very much for that.

[Moderator Eli Segal invited the audience to ask questions.]

The President. Would you introduce yourself and say where you're from if you ask a question in the audience?

Q. Certainly. My name is Ray Owens. I'm a native of Austin, Texas, here—live now in the New York area. And I'm with Teach For America, Mr. President—

The President. Good for you. Great program.

Q. —a national teaching corps, yes. And as you well know, we're the national teaching corps that's sending talented teachers who are accepting the responsibility to teach and serve in communities and neighborhoods that some educators have refused to work in, in great part because of the crime there. So in this regard, indeed, there are a number of people who still say that community policing is really more about community relations than it is about reducing crime.

I'm wondering how we can be sure that there's real substance in our community policing efforts.

The President. I think the best way to be sure of it is, first, to give as much—to go back to what—and keep in mind, this is a very appropriate question because Mr. Schumer's congressional subcommittee, I'll say again, is going to deal with this issue tomorrow. They are marking this bill up tomorrow. So this is a timely question.

My own judgment is, the best way is to say, here are the results we want to achieve. That is, we want the community involved; we want volunteers to be able to participate; we want each city or community to be able to define that however they want, except we're going to measure the results.

I think the main way to do it is not to tell everybody on the front end how they have to do it with a whole bunch of rules and regulations, but to cite some examples that have worked and then say we're going to measure results.

There are more than one way to do this. I mean, in the city of Houston, they had a 22-percent decline in the murder rate and a 27-percent decline in the crime rate in one year when they went to a community policing situation. I mean, 15 months, in a 15-month period. Not surprisingly, the mayor was re-elected with 91 percent of the vote, because they went to a community policing strategy that worked.

So my own judgment is, give the people who are on the ground and who have the biggest stake in the success of this the power to design the program, and then reward those programs that work and don't continue those programs that don't. I think you have to measure the results, because everyplace is going to be different.

[Geoffrey Canada, director, Rheedlan Center for Children and Families, New York City; Kevin Stansberry, youth service leader for the Safe Schools and Urban Schools Service Corps, Red Bank, NJ; and Frankie Rios, youth service leader, Safe Places, the Bronx, NY, spoke about their community programs.]

The President. Let me just ask all of you a little bit—you could see how moved this audience was by the sort of personal testi-

mony that each of you gave. One of the problems that I see with our national service program, because no program can do everything, is that we can provide volunteers to a community to support a program like yours if it's already going on. But not every community has somebody who would give up a career in corporate America where you could make more money and decide to do this.

And one of the things that I'd like to just explore with you is what you think the national service organization can do—because we are a national organization, and we have high visibility, and I do events like this all the time—what can we do to make sure that there are more programs like this out in the community so that we can steer the volunteers to them. I mean, if you don't exist, then the volunteers won't go there.

Now, there's a Boys and Girls Club nearly everywhere, and so they just need to organize themselves everywhere to take the volunteers. But there isn't necessarily a program to keep the schools safe or to keep the corridors safe going to and from school. That is a huge deal. In a lot of places where even the schools themselves are safe, the kids are very much at risk going to and from school. And I've had people talk to me about that all over the country.

So do you have any advice for me about how we can help to sort of replicate these programs so we can direct the volunteers to them?

[Messrs. Canada, Stansberry, and Rios discussed community organization and infrastructure in dealing with community issues.]

The President. I think if you've got a place, then the people will come and the programs will spring up, and they will do it. One of the things I wanted to say in support of that, because Mr. Schumer and I talked about it on the way up here, you may remember that a few weeks ago, maybe it's been a couple of months ago now, Reverend Jesse Jackson had a national meeting in Washington of the Rainbow Coalition group to talk about violence. And he called me—we've had now two conversations—we had a brief talk about it yesterday. He started kind of doing an inventory in Washington and then asked some people about it in New York, about how

many schools there were that didn't have real recreational opportunities for kids, especially if they weren't on athletic teams anymore.

And he went through an inventory with me just in Washington about, for example, within the city limits how many baseball fields there were that were really functioning and how there was no equipment for kids, and how many kids there were that never had a baseball bat in their hands until they were 14 or 15 years old now, and no swimming pools, no organized basketball programs, no bowling alleys, no skating rinks; these kinds of things.

I think we have maybe underestimated that in the last 15 years that our schools and our cities have been under such enormous financial pressures to cut back, cut back, cut back, maybe without even thinking about it, since these recreational programs for kids at large—not the stars on the athletic teams, but the kids at large—have been maybe the easiest things to cut. And one of the things that we talked about is whether we could have some of this national service money directed back to support these school-based programs so that you'll have something to do with the kids and have these activities. I think it's really important.

[Clementine Barfield, president, *Save Our Sons and Daughters*, discussed community crisis intervention and victim assistance, and Elizabeth Mathews, VISTA volunteer, discussed shelter and support for battered women and their children.]

Mr. Segal. Mr. President, do you have any questions or concerns? I saw you scribbling down there some thoughts.

The President. No, actually, I was just scribbling what I was learning from them, not what questions I wanted to ask.

I do want to say that each of you, in very different ways, is an incredibly powerful example, and I'm just, I can't say enough about it. I was very moved by both of you for very different reasons, but you were very powerful.

I want you to know that my—that before I became President, when I was still living at home in Arkansas, my wife and I spent a lot of time, a huge—a lot of time for what we had available with a friend of ours who

ran a shelter like the one in which you work. And we saw large numbers, especially around holiday times, of women and children horribly brutalized. And I just would like to say that one of the things you said, that I think we may miss in this—and another thing you said in terms of sympathy for the people who commit these crimes and then go to jail—is we've got to do something that changes the attitudes of people who think that the only way they can deal with their frustration and anger is to wreak violence on someone.

Now, if they do something really terrible, we have to punish them and send them to prison and do all that. But there are a lot of these people who can be reached before they do something really terrible. A lot of these children who knife and shoot other children are people who have never learned to deal with their anger or their anxiety in any other way. To them, the future is what happens 5 or 10 or 20 minutes from now, instead of what happens 5 or 10 or 20 years from now.

And so, I don't know what thoughts you have on that, but that's one thing I am continuously plagued by. I see people like you who come in and bravely give your lives to try to help people who are so savaged by this. And then I know that a lot of the people we're dealing with now, who perpetrate these kinds of crimes, themselves were the victims of domestic violence when they were young, themselves grew up in kind of chaotic and violent situations, and they have no other conditioned way to respond to these terrible things that happen to them. And I hope we can devote some time and attention to that.

[Clementine Barfield briefly discussed conflict resolution and the need to create a climate of peace, and Elizabeth Mathews discussed the need to prevent violence. Following their remarks, Molly Baldwin, director, Reach Out to Chelsea Adolescence, Chelsea, MA, and Sherman Spears, youth service leader, Oakland, CA, discussed conflict resolution among youth.]

The President. We don't want to let anybody off the hook here today. You know, no one has mentioned this, but one of the things that—one of the gentlemen did mention the images that come across to kids. But if you

look at the cumulative, instantaneous, reactive, macho violence you see in media entertainment programs, you know, it's not that one or two programs will change a kid's attitude, but the amount of it overall, I think, has a big impact.

And I also think when people turn on television and they see their National Government, what do you inevitably see? People with words, using extreme words to characterize conduct or activity or positions. The other politicians do it, the media do it, always trying to twist it like taffy to the *n*th degree. I don't know how many people—I've had older Members of the Congress tell me just in the last week how much meaner and partisan and negative the national arena is. Mr. Schumer was commenting, sadly, on it on the way in here today.

So I think all of us in positions of public responsibility need to think about that, need to think about what kind of message are we sending to young people when they see that kind of conduct. Look, if he, this fine young man here, can bury his anger and desire for revenge, he ought to be an example to all the rest of us who have so much less to be angry about.

Next time I want to get real mad, I'm going to think about you. And I hope everybody else in this country will. I thank you. You have no idea what a powerful example you are.

[A New York State Assemblyman asked about allocating money for States to use for education rather than for building prisons.]

The President. I'll say this: One big problem is, you know, that you can go into a Federal court and get an order to build a new prison and make it nice. Prisons not only have better schools than a lot of schools, they have, almost unfailingly, any prison built in the last 10 years has better recreational facilities than a public school or than a local park. The New York Times Sunday magazine had a stunning pictorial—I don't know how many of you saw it—pictorial exhibit a couple of weeks ago showing the prison and how beautiful they were and the schools and how run-down they were. So we have to try to change that. All I can tell you is if you look at what we're trying to do with the crime bill, we're

trying to give some resources to the States and to the communities to begin to turn that around.

I also think—look, let's go back to the police officers that started this. None of us want to be naive about this. Some people deserve to be punished and should be behind bars. But we do know that a very large percentage of the truly violent crimes are committed by a fairly small percentage of the criminals. So what we have to do is to try to identify the people that should be incarcerated and incarcerate them, have more community-based punishment for people that do less serious things, and try to do all the stuff you all have been here talking about today. And there ought to be some way of allocating the resources that recognizes the importance of doing all three things, instead of just that one thing. But there is no—the practical problem is that in the last 10 to 15 years, there's not only been an upsurge of violent crime, which has led us to build more prison cells, there's also been a huge spate of lawsuits, which have gotten us to build prisons nicer than our schools. And it's crazy; our priorities, therefore, have been turned upside-down. Our schools should be nicer than our prisons so people want to get into the schools. And I really think that's a problem.

Now, that's not to say I don't think there shouldn't be educational facilities in the prisons or recreational facilities. I do. I think it's crazy to turn people back out of prison when they're illiterate, when they won't have a chance to do well. I'm not campaigning against prison reform. I'm just pointing out just what you did. We haven't done enough to help the kids stay out in the first place.

[A participant discussed domestic violence and called for action to end it. Another participant then discussed gangs and congratulated some of the participants for rising above gang activities, and he then asked the following question:]

Q. My question to you, and perhaps to you, is how should we deal with gang members—like, okay, how should we deal with gang members and gang violence in our society today?

The President. Well, my short answer is—I mean it's something we could talk about

all day long, but I've spent a good deal of time talking with former gang members, with some present gang members. I've spent more time than Presidents usually do in inner-city areas, and I've thought about this a lot and talked to a lot of people who work on it. I mean, I think we heard a lot about it today. I think, first of all, you have to try to create the conditions for kids when they're young so they don't do that. There has to be alternative things.

Keep in mind, a lot of gangs grow up in a vacuum. Everybody that was introduced up here is a member of a gang. All these people who started organizations, that's what those organizations are, they're good gangs. Isn't that right? Isn't that right? I mean, every one of them, right? That is, we all want to be part of something that's bigger than ourselves, where we're really important because we're part of it, right? We do. This Public Allies, that's a good gang. That's what it is. It's something good that's wholesome and—*[applause]*. So if you live in a neighborhood where families have broken down, where there are no jobs and opportunities, where the school system is dysfunctional, where there's not a strong sense of community, somebody is going to organize something so people can be part of something, where they are important, and they matter.

And I think we have to recognize that, and we have to adopt some of these strategies to deal with it. Unfortunately—I mean, there are lots of things a President can do. You know, we can pass these programs and make these opportunities available. But in the end, people get saved the same way they get lost, one by one. And that's why all of you are so important to this. And that's why the power of his example—one picture—if somebody puts his picture in some newspaper in America tomorrow, talking about your story, it will be worth more words than I can spew out in 2 weeks or 2 years. And that's why I think the genius of this national service program is having more folks like you show up in good gangs to help to decide, community by community, how to create another way of life for all these folks. And you decide how it is. It will be different for different people in different places and different circumstances. And you will make the

decision. And all the Government will do is to empower more of you to be out there. That's what the whole national service thing is about.

[Mr. Segal closed the forum and asked the President to make final remarks.]

The President. Let me say first, I want to thank all the New York officials who came, including one I did not introduce, Alan Hevesi, the city comptroller. I want to thank all the people from volunteer groups who came. And especially, I want to thank my good friend Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, whose father's speech I quoted tonight, who has devoted her life to community service. Thank you for being here. And Eli, since you're giving your life to community service and you grew up in this community, I want to introduce your mother, who raised you in this neighborhood. Thank you for coming.

The one last message I want to leave all of you with is I want to thank all of you who are part of these efforts. You are conducting a quiet and sometimes not-so-quiet revolution in this country. The purpose of national service is to swell your numbers and increase your impact and give this country back to the people who want America to go on to the next century as the greatest country in the world and want to give every child a chance to live up to his or her God-given potential. That is what this is about.

So my last word is this: We need more of you. And anybody within the sound of my voice, we want you to call, find out about national service, find out about the community groups in your community, sign up and do something. We can change America.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:21 p.m. in the Center for Performing Arts, Brooklyn College. In his remarks, he referred to Vernon Latting, President, Brooklyn College, and Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, daughter of Robert F. Kennedy.

Remarks at the United Negro College Fund Dinner in New York City

March 10, 1994

The President. Thank you very much. I want to begin by expressing my appreciation for being able to join the honorees here tonight and all the distinguished Americans who are here, the presidents of the 41 UNCF colleges. Given my roots, I couldn't help noticing, of the 41 UNCF colleges, all but Wilberforce are located in the South. And sometimes I'm not so sure about Ohio and where it is. [Laughter] For any of you who are from there, that was a compliment from me.

You know, Bill Gray once came to Arkansas to give a speech for me, and I thanked him profusely. He was then the chairman of the House Budget Committee, perhaps the most powerful Member of the House at that time, except the Speaker. And he was exhausted, and he came down there. I said, "I cannot tell you how much I appreciate it." And he said, "Well, one of these days I'll give you a chance to demonstrate it." At the time, he knew more about my future than I did, I assure you. [Laughter]

I've been terribly impressed with the people who have been recognized here tonight, Stephen Wright and Arthur Fletcher, my longtime friend Vernon Jordan. You could chronicle his demise up there; his hair's going gray, and he's relegated to playing golf with me. [Laughter] I want to say a special word of recognition to Christopher Edley, Sr., because he has not only rendered great service to this organization but he has given me his son to be the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Now, the younger Mr. Edley was not so fortunate in his education. He was consigned to Swarthmore and Harvard. [Laughter] But he got over it, and he's doing quite nicely now in the Federal Government. I enjoyed the presentation to your distinguished alumni, Pearline Cox and—

Audience members. Yea!

The President. Cheer again. That's all right. Don't be shy, go ahead. [*Applause*]

And I was very impressed with Mrs. Trent not only for representing her husband's work but for setting the record straight on the way out. If it's all the same to you, ma'am, if you don't think you're too old to undertake a new challenge, I'd like to have you come to the White House and help me set the record straight, starting Monday morning. [*Laughter*]

I'd also like to say that every President since Franklin Roosevelt has supported this fine work, but it was an especially important cause for my predecessor, George Bush, and I'd like to thank him in his absence for the support he gave to the UNCF and thank his brother for the leadership he has given. Thank you, Mr. Bush, for your leadership, sir.

You know, when Bill Gray resigned from the Congress to take this job, I had an extended conversation with him, and I virtually cried when he told me he was leaving. But I now can look at him and his wonderful wife and see that there is life after politics, which is quite a wonderful thing because I can assure you there is less and less life in politics now than there used to be. [*Laughter*]

I never will forget the lesson Bill Gray gave all of us as chairman of the House Budget Committee when he believed that you actually could bring the deficit down and increase our investment in our people at the same time. That is what we are trying to do, and that is the path that he blazed. He also educated a reluctant National Government on the meaning of freedom when he got Congress to pass sanctions against South Africa and helped to put America on the right side of the struggle for freedom and democracy. Six weeks from now, South Africa will hold the first free elections in its history, and one of the great, beautiful, and painful ironies in history, the jailed Nelson Mandela, and the jailer, Mr. de Klerk, who set him free, in an election where people will freely choose the course of their future. And you had something to do with that, quite a bit, Bill Gray, and America thanks you and the world thanks you. I think we all ought to know that that election will not be the end of South Africa's struggles, it will just be the beginning of a

new phase, a phase in which free people will be called upon to overcome the legacy of their own past, a struggle in which we are still engaged in this country.

One thing that the UNCF has always known is that the more free you are, the more you need to know. One of our administration's principal initiatives will be to try to support higher education in South Africa and to try to foster stronger linkages between your institutions and the institutions of higher education in South Africa, so that together we can march into the future.

Today Bill Gray was notified by the Director of the Agency for International Development, Brian Atwood, in our administration, that the UNCF and the Hispanic Association of Higher Education are now going to work together to try to guarantee more participation in international aid programs for historically black colleges and universities throughout our country.

We have made a lot of progress since Dr. Patterson started his work and Franklin Roosevelt was President, a lot of progress since Benjamin Davis led soldiers in World War II simply to fight for their basic rights as citizens to defend this country. All the way along, those of you who have been part of the heart and soul of this administration have known that learning was the key to liberation.

I have been blessed in my administration with people who have graduated from the member schools of this distinguished group: the Energy Secretary, Hazel O'Leary, graduate of Fisk; my wonderful Presidential Assistant for Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, who graduated from Xavier and is here with me tonight; the Chief of Staff to the First Lady, Maggie Williams, and the Presidential Assistant for Personnel, Veronica Biggins, both graduated from Spelman, Dr. Cole; and my dear friend from Arkansas, our Nation's distinguished Surgeon General, Joycelyn Elders, graduated from Philander Smith, my State's contribution to this distinguished organization.

We have named the most distinguished and the most diverse group of Federal judges of any group in our history, and many of those who are African-Americans started their educational lives at UNCF schools. Today, 17 of the 40 Members of Congress

who are African-Americans and members of the Congressional Black Caucuses came from your schools.

In November, I signed an Executive order on Historically Black Colleges and Universities and committed our administration to their collective progress under the leadership of Catherine LeBlanc, who is here tonight with me. Since then, we have proposed putting more money into programs like Upward Bound, increasing funding for Pell grants, guaranteeing a new \$375 million historically black colleges and universities capital financing program, and creating a whole new system of college loans so that our young people can borrow money to go to college at lower interest rates and pay it back on better terms, so that young people will never be discouraged from borrowing money to go to college because of the burden of repaying it and never be discouraged from taking a more public-service-oriented job when they get out because their salaries will be insufficient to cover the cost of the loan. Now they can elect to pay it back as a percentage of their income over a long period of time.

And finally, we have, I hope and believe, at long last lifted the cloud that had been hanging over scholarships for minorities and said we will support them and we believe in them, because learning is the key to liberation.

What I want to say to you in closing is this, my friends: If learning is the key to full freedom in America, it must necessarily be true also that people must be free to learn. And too many of our young people are no longer truly free to learn.

I had an astonishing experience today in Brooklyn, before I came here, I met at Brooklyn College with several hundred young students there and young volunteers in community service programs all across the country. And we heard presentations from nine people who painted a stark portrait of America as it is: a wonderful woman from Detroit whose two sons had been shot down in a gang fight, one of them dying, who channeled her heartbreak into building a program, the acronym of which is SOSAD, to try to give young people the chance to avoid the fate that her son met. We met there today a young teenager from Oakland, California,

who had been caught in a crossfire and had his body shattered. He lost an eye. He was paralyzed from his waist down. One of his legs had been amputated. He was confined to a wheelchair. And do you know, he is spending his life telling people who are the victims of violence, of gunshot wounds, and knife wounds, not be full of vengeance and bitterness, and trying to convince them and their families not to shoot back, not to stab back, not to fight back, but instead to build back their lives. This young man riveted that crowd. There were many others who came there, a young man from New Jersey who left a corporate career in New York and instead took his necktie off and put a T-shirt and decided to devote the rest of his life to building one-on-one relationships with kids in trouble, to give them a chance to get to the point where they would be free to learn. These are the kinds of people that I met.

But what I find is, even though there are hundreds, indeed, thousands of these stories all across America, you and I know that we're still losing an awful lot of our children. When the UNCF started—you think about this—when the UNCF started, just about everybody associated with its creation believed two things: number one, if you could make everybody free of discrimination, and number two, if you could give everybody the chance to get a good education, we could have real freedom and real opportunity and real community in America. We assume that.

If anybody had told anyone 50 years ago that after 50 years there would be 2,000 people a year killed by gunshot wounds in New York City alone, no one would have believed that. If anybody had told the founders of this organization 50 years ago that the out-of-wedlock birthrate in many of our cities would be in excess of 50 percent and that it gets worse and worse and worse as people are driven more and more and more into poverty, no one would have believed that. If anyone had said 50 years ago, what we're going to do with all this freedom in 50 years is have a flowering African-American middle class, an enormous explosion of entrepreneurs, unparalleled achievement by hoards of young professionals, and a dark flip-side in which people are killing each other with reckless abandon and people's lives are being lost and

more and more young people are living in chaos and gangs, which people have feared, have been created, I am convinced, to do nothing more than fill the vacuum which has been created by the absence of family and community, of effective schooling and strong community organizations and hope, no one would have believed it.

And so I say to you, as we celebrate all the achievements that we see around this room tonight, as we celebrate all the achievements we know that are to come, we must recognize the inherent limits on the programs I just outlined and the support I just mentioned and the work that you are doing, unless we can also go back and pick up the rest of our brothers and sisters who are beyond the reach of these efforts.

And so I ask you to honor your past by creating a new freedom for those who have been left behind in this brave new world in which there is so much good and so much bad existing side by side. All these other kids count, too, the ones that will never get to your doors unless you and all of your schools participate in this national service program and have your kids out there tutoring these kids, turning these kids away from violence, teaching people in our schools that there are nonviolent ways to resolve your angers, your frustrations, your disappointments, the thwarting we all feel every day in our lives. You can do that. You can teach the illiterate to read. You can teach the frustrated to be peaceful. You can raise the children up when they are very young. You can help to implant values into children who aren't getting them in other places. You have a larger, a different, a more profound mission than ever before.

I want to support you in that mission, too, because I know, I know, if we can get back to the point where the promise of all those ads we saw tonight, from the very first to Maya Angelou's magnificent poem, if we can do that, then this country's going to be all right. But if you want to hear somebody singing that poem over and over in their head, "And still I rise and still I rise and still I rise," it has to be true not just for the best of us but for all the rest of us. That is our challenge. Let us do our best to meet it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:38 p.m. at the Sheraton Hotel and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to United Negro College Fund president and chief executive officer William H. Gray III; former presidents Stephen Wright and Vernon Jordan; former executive director Arthur A. Fletcher; former chief executive officer Christopher Edley; Viola Trent, wife of William Trent, first executive director; founder Frederick C. Patterson; and author Maya Angelou. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the "Maritime Security and Trade Act of 1994"

March 10, 1994

Today my administration is sending to the Congress the "Maritime Security and Trade Act of 1994." This legislation represents an important step forward to assuring America's future as a maritime nation.

A modern merchant United States flag fleet, with skilled U.S. mariners, will provide not only jobs and economic benefits but also an important sealift capability in times of national emergency. My administration's proposal calls for a \$1 billion, 10-year program to revitalize the U.S. maritime industry. I look forward to working with the Congress to secure approval for this important legislation.

Remarks Announcing the Summit of the Americas

March 11, 1994

The President. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen. Today's announcement is good for our Nation and good for our hemisphere. This has been a very important year and a couple of months for this hemisphere. Late last year, in an historic choice, the American people and the Congress embraced NAFTA, which will establish the world's largest free-trade zone, create jobs, and bolster the growth of democracy in market economies. In December, right after the NAFTA vote, the Vice President went to Mexico City, as he said, and announced my intention to host a meeting of democratically elected heads of state and government in this hemisphere.

Today, I am pleased to announce that the Summit of the Americas will be held in early December in the city of Miami. [Applause] Thank you. The diversity, the dynamism, the applause meter—[laughter]—all make Miami an ideal site for this meeting. Miami's economy is fully integrated with the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean. In so many ways, it represents the promise of hemispheric integration. The Summit of the Americas will be an historic event, will be the first meeting of hemispheric leaders in over a generation, and it will be the first-ever hemispheric meeting of democratically elected leaders.

Let me say a word about why this summit matters so much to us here at home in the United States. Our Nation has a major stake in the prosperity and freedom of the entire hemisphere. Our exports to Latin America and the Caribbean have more than doubled in just 7 years, rising to nearly \$80 billion in 1993. That has generated hundreds of thousands of new jobs for American workers. If we can continue to bring down hemispheric trade barriers, we can create a million new jobs by the turn of the century. At the same time, the rising tide of democracy in this hemisphere helps make us more secure. Democracies tend not to fight one another; they make better partners in trade and diplomacy. And as we work with our neighbors to build more free, prosperous, and secure relations throughout this hemisphere, this summit will advance our common efforts and our shared interests.

When the Summit of the Americas convenes in Miami, we will crown a process of intensive consultation that will begin next week when the Vice President travels to Bolivia, Argentina, and Brazil to meet with the leaders of those nations. In the coming months, I will be working with my hemispheric counterparts to develop a full and productive agenda for this summit. We want to consider two broad themes: first, how to strengthen our democracies, defend them collectively, and improve our governance; second, how to promote economic growth while advancing a strategy of sustainable development that protects the environment and alleviates poverty. To help to define our agenda, we will also encourage business,

labor, and nongovernmental organizations all across the hemisphere to exchange ideas and propose initiatives that can enrich the summit deliberations.

We've arrived at a moment of very great promise and great hope for the Western Hemisphere. Democratic values are ascendant. Our economies are growing and becoming more intertwined every day through trade and investment. Now we have a unique opportunity to build a community of free nations, diverse in culture and history, but bound together by a commitment to responsive and free government, vibrant civil societies, open economies, and rising living standards for all our people.

So as we prepare for this Summit of the Americas, let us think boldly and set forth a vision of progress for all our people. Let us begin the work of building a genuine new community for all of us in this hemisphere. Thank you very much.

[At this point, Christopher Thomas, Assistant Secretary General, Organization of American States; Muni Figures, Director of External Relations, Inter-American Development Bank; and Gov. Lawton Chiles of Florida made brief remarks.]

The President. I'd like to just say, in closing, a couple of things. First of all, I don't think anyone who is not aware of this process can possibly understand the energy and the persistence and the thought that went into the application that Governor Chiles pressed for Miami to host this conference. I compliment him and my long-time friend Buddy McKay, for the work that they did and the way they did it. They did not make me witness grown men crying—[laughter]—but all short of that was tried.

I'd also like to say a special word of thanks to my former colleague, as a Governor and a Senator, Bob Graham, and to the other members of the congressional delegation for the work that they did in pressing this cause. But most of all, I have to tell you that I have been deeply moved over the last few years when I've had the opportunity to go to Miami and to south Florida and see the heroic efforts that people have made to deal not only with the aftermath of the hurricane but to build a genuine multicultural, multiracial so-

ciety that would be at the crossroads of the Americas and, therefore, at the forefront of the future. In the end, I think that this decision was made on the merits, because our best hopes to do things that democracies find difficult to do—get people together across racial and economic and ethnic lines—lies in the efforts that are being made there now. And I believe that in December, we will have a great gathering in a place that can symbolize the future toward which we are all tending. Thank you very much, we're adjourned.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:37 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

March 5

In the morning, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton went to Camp David, MD, for the weekend.

March 6

In the evening, the President and Hillary and Chelsea Clinton returned from Camp David, MD.

March 7

The President announced the appointment of Joseph H. Flom as Chair of the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

March 8

The President announced his intention to nominate Victor Zonana as Assistant General Counsel of the Treasury. In this position, he will serve as Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service.

March 9

The President announced his intention to nominate Raymond G. Romero as the Asst-

ant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs for the Department of Transportation.

The White House announced the President will meet with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel at the White House on March 16.

March 10

In the morning, the President traveled to New York City. In the afternoon, he met with officers at the 61st Precinct in Brooklyn. He then met with Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York at the Sheraton New York.

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced the President's policy on the sale of space-based remote sensing systems and data products.

March 11

The President announced his intention to nominate Cynthia A. Metzler to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Administration and Management.

The President declared a major disaster exists in Virginia and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by flooding and a severe winter ice storm from February 8 to 12.

The President declared a major disaster exists in Pennsylvania and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by a series of winter storms from January 4 to February 25.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted March 7

Edward William Gnehm, Jr., of Georgia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations,

with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

David Elias Birenbaum,
of the District of Columbia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador.

Submitted March 8

Barbara C. Jurkas,
of Michigan, to be U.S. Marshal for the Western District of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice John R. Kendall.

Ernestine Rowe,
of Colorado, to be U.S. Marshal for the District of Colorado for the term of 4 years, vice Jack Egnor.

Leonard Trupo,
of West Virginia, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Ronald A. Donell.

Submitted March 9

Billy Michael Burrage,
of Oklahoma, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern, Eastern, and Western Districts of Oklahoma, vice H. Dale Cook, retired.

Clarence Cooper,
of Georgia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, vice Richard C. Freeman, retired.

Denise Page Hood,
of Michigan, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, vice George E. Woods, retired.

Terry C. Kern,
of Oklahoma, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Oklahoma (new position).

Solomon Oliver, Jr.,
of Ohio, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, vice Alice M. Batchelder, elevated.

Richard A. Paez,
of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California (new position).

Submitted March 11

Clark G. Fiester,
of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice G. Kim Wincup, resigned.

Kate Pew Wolters,
of Michigan, to be a member of the National Council on Disability for a term expiring September 17, 1995, vice Alvis Kent Waldrep, Jr., term expired.

Checklist of White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released March 5

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing Gen. John R. Galvin, USA, Ret., will head the U.S. team on talks on the transitional military arrangements in Bosnia

Released March 7

Fact sheet on the U.S.-Georgian Bilateral Investment Treaty

Memorandum distributed to all members of the White House staff on the grand jury subpoena for documents

Released March 8

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Robert E. Rubin on the G-7 jobs conference

Fact sheet on U.S. assistance to Georgia

Released March 9

Transcript of a press briefing by Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich on the proposed "Re-employment Act of 1994"

Released March 10

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing the administration will

allow foreign access to remote sensing space capabilities

Fact sheet on foreign access to remote sensing space capabilities

Released March 11

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant to the President for Economic Policy Robert E. Rubin, Council of Economic Advisers Chair Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown, Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich, and Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen on the G-7 jobs conference

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the Summit of the Americas

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved March 9

H.R. 2339 / Public Law 103-218
Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals With Disabilities Act Amendments of 1994

H.R. 3617 / Public Law 103-219
To amend the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, and for other purposes